

Secretarial Notes on the Sixth Annual Conference of Deans and Advisers of Men Held at the University of Michigan, April 24-25-26, 1924

FIRST SESSION

The first session of the conference was called to order by the President, Dean Bursley of the University of Michigan, at 10 a.m. in Room 308 of the Michigan Union.

Owing to illness, President Burton was unable to be present and welcome the visitors.

The President, Dean Bursley, called on Dean Goodnight, of the University of Wisconsin, who spoke on

HOW CAN A DEAN OF MEN BEST SERVE THE UNIVERSITY AND WHAT ARE THE PRINCIPAL AND TYPICAL FUNCTIONS OF A DEAN OF MEN

The subject assigned me is a very wide one, and various phases of it have been brought before us at each of our preceding meetings. This opening paper will therefore not seek to treat the subject exhaustively, but will endeavor first to outline the principal and typical functions of the Dean of Men and then to single out one of them as a basis for discussion by the Conference.

In the most meager outline of our duties, I find it necessary to include at least five items, and I am fully aware that this enumeration omits many important matters.

In the order of first magnitude, I should be inclined to place the personal work of the Dean of Men with individual students. These conferences touch every conceivable phase of student life, afford a wonderful opportunity for giving timely aid and counsel, and also enable the dean to gain an insight into student modes of thought which he could not acquire in any other manner. It is through these personal contacts, as has been so ably set forth by Deans Coulter and Clark at former meetings, that the Dean of Men can contribute most toward character-building in the student body, and surely he can have no more important duty.

Another most significant function which falls to him by virtue of his office to perform, is that of a liaison officer between the two divisions of the great army which is fighting on each campus the great battle against ignorance and narrowness. For these two divisions, supposedly co-operative and striving toward a common end, often misunderstand each other and work at cross purposes. It is a very important function of the Dean of Men to serve as the medium of communication between the university administration and the faculty on the one hand and the student body on the other. While he may occasionally alter the faculty position by means of an effective presentation of the student viewpoint, he will find, in the main, his chief task to be that of winning respect for faculty opinion by tactful and sympathetic representation of it to the students, either individually, or in groups. The service of the Dean of Men to the university will never be what it should be, if he cannot reconcile student sentiment to a decent regard for college work and for the purposes of college training.

Again, in many institutions, the Dean of Men is the officer to whose immediate charge is committed the admitting or rejecting of students, the dismissing or readmitting of delinquents, the supervision of the grading and records of the students, the vexed question of absence from classes, and other matters pertaining directly to scholarship. Particularly in dealing with delinquent students does he come into contact with those who most need guidance and counsel or warning and restraint, and while such a position in a large institution requires much time and much clerical assistance, it nevertheless fits in admirably with the nature of the work a Dean of Men is expected to perform and affords him abundant scope for extending his influence.

Then, too, the Dean of Men may be so unfortunate as to be the disciplinary officer of the university. He may have to ferret out transgressors, hear cases, adjudge penalties, and also, by more constructive methods, work to prevent bad conduct and to forestall the necessity for disciplinary action. Unlike the work with students delinquent in scholarship, however, this function is a liability rather than an asset, so far as the influence of the Dean of Men is concerned. It brings him in contact, to be sure, with those who are in need of guidance, and affords him an opportunity by no means to be despised of bringing erring ones to a realization of their danger, yes, even of reclaiming brands from the burning. But on the other hand, he soon becomes known on the campus as the disciplinary officer, as the wielder of the big stick, whose acquaintance it is well to shun, and there is no more difficult barrier to overcome in the matter of gaining and keeping the confidence and the good will of the student body. Happy is the Dean of Men who is privileged to leave disciplinary matters to others and can even appear as the counsellor and confidential adviser of the student who is in trouble. He has a vastly better opportunity of extending his influence and thereby accomplishing constructive undertakings on the campus than can he who is compelled to play policeman. Even the better dispositioned students are often inclined to yield to the almost instinctive student reaction of regarding the disciplinary officer as the common enemy.

Finally, in all institutions in which there is a Dean of Men, he is presumably the functionary who has the direct supervision of the extra-curricular activities of the student body, insofar at least as they are supervised. These activities constitute an industry which in modern times has become so vast as seriously to imperil the real work of education, and it is in this field that miracles are expected of us.

It is true that the duties of individual Deans of Men in various institutions differ enormously. For example, in one university, the Dean of Men may have virtually nothing to do with the admission and rejection of incoming students, the relegation of failures, and the treatment of those delinquent in scholarship. In another case, he may be virtually free from disciplinary responsibilities and may devote the major portion of his time and energy to the administration of scholastic requirements. It is conceivable that another may be so preoccupied with one or the other of the above functions and with the supervision of the multitudinous student activities that he may neglect, or at least fail to cultivate and develop as he should, the personal relationships and the liaison position which should of right be his, leaving to others the mediator's position between the two great parts of the university.

It is almost inconceivable, however, that a Dean of Men should not have a very important part to play in the supervision of the extra-curricular activities of the student body. Indeed, this very factor has probably had more to do with the creation of the office in many institutions than any other. This was true at

Wisconsin at least, and this function of the regulation of student activities, aiming to promote more general participation on the part of the students at large, to curb excessive participation on the part of the few, to protect curricular interests from encroachments of the all engrossing distractions and to keep down petty graft and other evils—these have been regarded on our campus as the chief business of the Dean of Men.

First permit me to say, however, if it has not been apparent from what I have already said, that I do not choose this phase of our work for special consideration because I regard it as the most important one. I regard, as do you, character-building as the fundamental function of the Dean of Men and the immense privilege he has of personal work, of sympathetic guidance and counsel, of influencing the lives of both individuals and groups, as his greatest asset. It is in this matter, too, that he can be of the greatest utility to the university, for the character of the student body is a composite of the individuals that compose it, and a betterment of the character of the individuals is the most effective educational work which can be done at a university.

If then I seem to depart from the topic as assigned me by our host, the president, and take up what may appear to be a side issue, I hope it may not be interpreted as due to either lack of understanding or discourtesy. Of the more important phases of our work, this is the one which has been less fully presented at our previous meetings and it is one which concerns my own work very deeply. I return then to my statement that the office of the Dean of Men developed at Wisconsin, and probably, too, elsewhere, primarily from a feeling of the great need for adequate supervision of the student activities, and that, for this reason, I suspect that the instinctive reaction of a majority of my colleagues on the faculty, if they were suddenly asked, "Why is a Dean of Men?" would be to reply that his chief business is to look after the campus activities.

It came about in this way. In 1905-6 a faculty agitation was begun relative to the graft, professionalism, and misappropriation of funds said to be rampant in intercollegiate athletics. In the following year, the faculties of neighboring universities were asked to aid and the result of the movement was the revamping of the Western Intercollegiate Athletic Conference into its present form. A few years later, a fraternity investigation was launched which had as a result the appointment of a committee to regulate these organizations. Still later, this committee had to take cognizance of petty graft and other irregularities in student publications and class affairs. In the spring of 1913 a grand galaxy of extra-curricular activities just prior to the final examination period brought about an unusual number of low grades and aroused the ire of the faculty. The latter proceeded to strengthen and increase the scope of the Committee on Student Life and Interests and to relieve its chairman of all teaching duties so that he might be free to devote his full time to the administration of the affairs of the committee. Two years later the title of Dean of Men was conferred upon this chairman, but no change whatever in his duties was prescribed, and the committee continues in operation to this day. The office thus developed naturally out of the situation and its original duties were distinctly those of a supervising administrator of faculty regulations governing student activities. Other duties have developed similarly since that time, and the organization of a student senate and a student court, with which the dean's office seeks ever to maintain a relationship of cordial co-operation, has altered the situation to some extent. A cursory examination, however, of the following outline of the functions at present carried on by the office will clearly show what a large share of the work is devoted to the supervision of student activities.

It is distinctly a field of work that is worthy of the best effort which a man can give to it. It involves working and counseling with the ablest students on the campus. It presents opportunities for service to the students in a way which they appreciate highly. It also involves an occasional opportunity for inculcating methods of sound business practice and for advocating square dealing, as well as efficiency. It permits one to encourage initiative and to recognize faithful service. And finally, it allows scope for the encouragement of scholarship and of character-building among those who are showing the quality of leadership among their fellows. In truth it is a field which the Dean of Men cannot afford to slight.

DISCUSSION

DEAN NICHOLSON—You spoke of not enforcing the regulations. Do the regulations apply to both men and women?

DEAN GOODNIGHT—The Dean of Women has the matter of the women in charge and I think that women are required to live in approved houses.

DEAN RIENOW—What would be the effect if that regulation were to be extended to the men? Is there any reason why men should be permitted to live in unapproved houses any more than women and if we were to extend that regulation as rigidly what would be the reaction of the men?

DEAN GOODNIGHT—That has never been tried and my answer would be entirely an opinion. My feeling is that we do not need to throw all the safeguards around men students that we do around women students. There are men living in houses at Wisconsin which are not modern, some of them have to build their own fires in stoves and that sort of thing. Rooms in such houses can be obtained for \$2 per week, but I would not think of asking a young woman to live under conditions like that.

DEAN RIPLEY—Do you pay any attention to the number of students living in one house?

DEAN GOODNIGHT—There is a special building code which limits the number of students which may be accommodated in a house according to the number of bathrooms, fire escapes, etc. We keep to that building code and if we find any deviation from it we notify the building inspector.

DEAN BRADSHAW—Have any institutions represented here experienced this situation?

ANSWER—Texas and several others.

DEAN GOODNIGHT—I am becoming more and more convinced that we should not allow boys to live in \$2 rooms. It makes character-building almost impossible. It is a difficult situation. We cleared out a house last week because the owner of the house had been accused of stealing coal.

DEAN McCLENAHAN—We have had in Princeton for a number of years this same sort of inspection. We permit no student to live in a house not on the approved list. No student is permitted to live in a house that does not satisfy the minimum requirements of equipment, water, plumbing facilities, and fire escapes and no student is permitted to room otherwise. All parties are registered in my office with the names of the chaperons.

QUESTION—Do you still have chaperons?

DEAN GOODNIGHT—We still have and insist upon them for any kind of a party?

QUESTION—Are they alive?

DEAN NICHOLSON—Do you have a required number of chaperons?

DEAN GOODNIGHT—We require one couple at least, one married lady. In case of large functions where several hundred students will be present half a dozen are required.

DEAN STEIMLE—We have three floors and also a musical temple for dancing. We pay the Musical Association for all Friday and Saturday night dances through the year and we control parties of every kind whether our own or not. These parties are chaperoned. The parties given by people from out of town at the musical temple are given under our direction and are chaperoned and the rent paid to us.

DEAN RIENOW—Last year we had a situation develop that was positively bad. Drinking was quite common. Students would go to parties pretty well intoxicated, that is, some students. The big majority that attend these parties are clean, but half a dozen can get in and spoil a whole party. We had tried one system for years, we had a list of approved chaperons, whatever that might mean, and they were supposed to make reports. The result was that our committee, which is made up of six faculty members and six students, got together at the close of the year and decided that at the beginning of this year there would be no university parties unless we could receive some reasonable assurance on the part of the Student Council that parties would be conducted in an orderly manner. That meant that there would be no class parties. It did not dawn upon them what it meant and the first thing I knew I received a request to make arrangements for the sophomore dance and I had to say that I did not think there would be any dance and explained to them the decision previously made, and immediately the campus began to buzz and the next day I was visited by the president of the Student Council and asked under what conditions we would permit them to have the dance. I told him that we wanted them to have the party, but that we could not permit parties such as were given the year previous. I asked him if he could give us reasonable assurance that these parties would be taken care of. The result was a meeting of the Student Council which had not met for several months. They reached a plan whereby the council would take care of the chaperons and that at each party there should be not less than two, or more than four, of the members of the Student Council invited by the organization giving the party and they were to be asked as guests and they were to have complimentary tickets and have taxis sent for them and were to be put in the receiving line and were to look after the situation. We found that our chaperons could not be at the place where the liquid refreshments were most frequently served. It is asking a great deal of a chaperon to be in the cloakroom or outside or to look around in the coat pockets, but a student knows exactly what is going on.

DEAN CLARK—We do not ask students to live in approved houses, but we do ask them to move out of houses where conditions are not satisfactory. We do require chaperons for parties and I think some of them show slight indication of life. We have to have a report from the chairman of the social committee of each dance. We report to the office of the Dean of Women. Committee on Student Activities may refuse further privileges to those who do not report in the regular way. The Dean of Women sends a notice to each chaperon telling them that they have been appointed and asking for any comment. Two reports are sent out, one a week before the party and the other within two days after the party. This last one gives the names of the chaperons present, what time they arrived, what time they left and what time the dance closed, and if they remained through the entire affair. If a report is found to be false the organization is not allowed to give another dance during the year. We are not more virtuous than others, but we have practically no drinking at our dances. We have disciplined the men

pretty severely who took liquor to a dance, either in their pockets or their alimentary canals.

QUESTION—How do you find out about it?

DEAN CLARK—I am as intelligent as the average.

QUESTION—How do you prove it?

DEAN CLARK—They admit it. How do you get the facts? Just the same way as I do: I get the college gossip; I go places; men come to visit me. It is perfectly easy it seems to me to get the information as to whether there is drinking at certain dances.

QUESTION—How do you know who it was?

DEAN CLARK—I ask who was there that I know and then I can tell.

QUESTION—Would you suspend a student who had been drinking at a dance?

DEAN CLARK—If I beat him to it, and for that reason they come to me first.

DEAN HUBBARD—How many institutions require chaperons at dances?

ANSWER BY VOTE—About one-half.

DEAN COULTER—Our fraternities nearly all of them have members of the faculty who are members of their fraternity and they invite these members to their dances. They report everything all right.

I find that if you let a student sit across a desk from you and talk and keep on talking it is not very long before you have all the information. We are not a court of justice when we are handling these students. I never find that I can go out and get information, but I find that if I sit still and show sympathy that the students will come and talk with me.

DEAN FIELD—I wish to report on a situation at Georgia Tech. When they took up the question last fall of a certain dance I faced them with the facts that came to me a year ago and told them that it was simply up them to prevent a similar trouble or have no dance at all. They went so far as to pledge every member of every fraternity not to drink at all and also pledged those men who were invited in by fraternities and they numbered the tickets and put the names on the tickets.

QUESTION—Have rooming houses ever been reinspected as to existing conditions?

DEAN GOODNIGHT—Nothing of that sort has been done at Madison. We have only one inspector to inspect 1400 houses and she cannot inspect all of them. We get reports of houses by junior deans who refer the cases to me. The worst situation that I have to deal with is the commercial dormitory. They have rooms arranged for two or four. There is not adequate supervision and you cannot get a real estate agent to put adequate supervision into the place. The boys have no dealings with their neighbors outside and this is where I have my greatest trouble.

DEAN CLARK—We do make a study of the students who live more than two in a room. The students could live farther away from the institution if they would, but they would rather live near the institution and crowd into rooms that are small than they would to be a mile away and be more comfortable. The result of the scholastic averages shows that where more than two students live in a room the average is low. We do not feel in a position to tell students that they may not live in that way, but we advise them individually and collectively not to do so and we advise those who are renting rooms that it is detrimental to students so to live.

DEAN BRADSHAW—Our experience at North Carolina has been similar to the experience of Iowa, but our principal trouble came from alumni. We had a Vigilance Committee appointed to take off the floor any man who ought to be taken off, either alumni or students.

The next paper presented was by Dean Clark, of the University of Illinois, on

**HOW CAN A DEAN OF MEN COME INTO CLOSER PERSONAL
CONTACT WITH STUDENTS IN A LARGE UNIVERSITY**

One of the main arguments advanced in favor of the small college as opposed to the big university is the fact that the small college offers so much more opportunity for personal contact between the individual undergraduate and the individual member of the faculty than does the larger institution. In a small college where the enrolment does not exceed a few hundreds it is quite within the range of possibility for the President or for the Dean at least to know everyone by his first name and to keep closely in touch with everyone. It is alleged that in a big university there is no possibility of any extensive personal contact between any specific university officer and the great mass of undergraduates.

Whether or not there is such personal relationship existing between faculty and students in the small college, is not for me to say. I am sure that such a relationship is very helpful and quite possible, but when I was an undergraduate in the University of Illinois the number of men registered was fewer than three hundred and the President personally wrote out each man's study list at the opening of each term and signed it himself, yet I am sure that few if any of us felt that we had any personal touch with the President or thought that he had any specific interest in us as individuals or knowledge of us. A great many undergraduate irregularities took place, student pranks and escapades were of almost daily occurrence, but no one was apprehended or disciplined because, for the most part I think, the President did not know his students well enough to locate the source of trouble. He would have been very much surprised to learn what we all knew very well, that one of the main sources of trouble was in his own household. So I say that though the personal touch is much more easily obtained in the small college than in the big university, I am not sure that one will always find it there. Nor am I convinced that a general personal relationship is impossible of attainment in the big university, for it is this result as Dean of Men that I have been attempting to attain in my own institution during the past twenty years.

I think I need not argue long in favor of such a relationship in college. The boy away from home for the first time who feels that no one knows him, that no one wants to know him, and that no one cares, may sometimes be stimulated to greater initiative and stronger self-reliance by that feeling, but more often the result is a weakened loyalty, discouragement, and sometimes moral decline. It is not easy to say how many of us are kept at our tasks, unpleasant as they are at times, because someone knows and cares, because someone has an interest expressed or implied. How many of us are kept moral and clean for a similar reason? We do our work, many of us, to please our mothers or our wives or our friends or our boss; we walk straight in respect for what the neighbors or the Dean or our pastors would say or think, though, of course, some of us occasionally do right because it is right. It is a great deterrent, however, to any boy when he is having a struggle with himself either mentally or morally to realize that someone knows and sympathizes and that there is for him an open door which he may enter and present his troubles. There are strong arguments that appeal even to a Presbyterian in favor of the confessional in some form or other.

"You never called me when I was in college," one of our graduates said to me a few years ago, "and I always wondered why. I often came to see you of my own accord, and though I told you little about my personal life, I was always sure that you knew. I should rather have resented your saying anything about my personal affairs, I think, but the fact that you knew and that I knew what you

wanted me to do was a great help to me. It often kept me from evil; ultimately it changed my conduct. I don't know what would have happened had I been sure that no one knew."

Why did I not talk to him? I am not sure that I can answer excepting that I know that a man who is summoned to appear before any constituted official to answer for his sins always comes on the defensive; he means if possible to explain and to justify his conduct and one seldom gets anywhere with him. It is only when the man comes of his own volition and desire that one accomplishes much. Slater was never ready to talk to me, and I had a certain intuition that my best play was to influence him indirectly. I suspected that for once, at least, I was right, for though he is married now and a thousand miles away, he always sends me a Christmas letter, and tells me what I did for him.

As I have said, there is no argument needed to prove the advantages of the personal touch in college. It is a source of encouragement, of inspiration, of moral and intellectual strength and of social control. These are facts that are being recognized in almost every reputable college in the country and college organization is being changed to bring about more easily this personal relationship between students and faculty. In most colleges it has been a good thing in theory to see that the undergraduate who was hungry or sick or in the city jail was looked after personally, but it was no one's special business to do it, so it was not strange if sometimes the man who was sick had to look after himself and the fellow who was chucked into jail early in the evening lingered there without special attention from any member of the faculty until court opened the next morning.

As I see the matter, the job of those men who are doing religious work in the colleges for the various churches of the country is not dissimilar to my own. We are both trying to make moral and social conditions better, we are interested in the individual and what we can do for him, and we must all in time come to realize that about the most that we can do is to make his environment as satisfactory as possible, to quicken his conscience, to stiffen his backbone and to stimulate him to take responsibility, and to give him an opportunity to put before us his personal problems.

A religious worker said to me not long ago, "You have a great advantage over us. Whenever you want a man you can write him a note and he has no alternative; he must come and see you whether he wants to or not."

I am not at all sure that this is an advantage, for, as I have said before, the man who is forced to come very seldom does so in the right spirit. Advice given unasked is like a great many other things we get for nothing, it is valued very cheaply.

"Did you want to see me?" the Dean asks of the young freshman who comes in awkwardly and stands before his desk.

"No; I didn't want to," was the reply, "but I had to."

The man who has to come encases himself in a sort of armor before coming that is difficult if not impossible to penetrate. I think sometimes that because of the fact that I am a disciplinary officer my task is made more difficult than it otherwise would be, and that rather than having an advantage over the other man, he, on the contrary, has some advantage over me.

I think, also, that, in a general way, if we are to succeed that our methods must be somewhat the same, and if you don't mind, I am going to tell you a little in detail of what my methods have been, and of some things that I have learned.

The work of developing these personal relationships with students was a new work to me as it was to most people twenty years ago. No one so far as I know had ever given himself over to it. Personally, I had neither the intention nor the desire to do so. I was teaching English composition with some success, and I

had no desire to do anything else. The President at that time got all the "personal touch" in our institution that anyone was supposed to get. If a student was in trouble he went to the President; if he should be gotten into trouble it was the President's business to do it. But the President was busy, and occasionally the undergraduate was too much for him, and he was forced to send out a call for help. It was on one of these distressing occasions that he sent for me, and by some lucky chance, I got him out of trouble and saved the boy. It was following this event that he conceived the, for him at least, happy idea of making me official trouble man. I balked for a year, but ultimately, seeing there was no other way to get rid of him, I consented.

I had no specific duties, no special authority, no precedents either to guide me or to handicap me. It was an untried sea upon which I was to set sail. My only chart was that the action of the Board of Trustees said I was to interest myself in the individual student. This meant, of course, that I was to know something, so far as it was possible for any one individual to do so, of the student's living conditions, his moral and social life, and his personal, individual problems. If I were to know these, I must first of all, I realized, be able to separate each individual from all the rest, and each undergraduate must come to mean something personal and individual to me. He must be more than a part of a great group.

Whether previous to this time I had shown any particular ability thus to differentiate the individual, I cannot say. If I did have, no one had ever detected it or accused me of remembering people's names or faces or personal histories better than the ordinary. I had always liked my students, and had taken a friendly interest in them, but now I realized that if I were to do well the tasks assigned to me, I must know more about the men than I had hitherto known. And so I interested myself in where the various men lived, the conditions surrounding them in their lodging houses, their companions, where they spent their leisure hours, what sorts of homes they came from, and what personal difficulties they were encountering.

I had some leisure and I visited a good many men in their lodging houses as I made friends with them. If anyone was ill, I called on him and wrote his parents, and saw that he was properly taken care of, that he had the right sort of doctor and decent nursing. I made it clear that anyone might come to see me at any time, as he still may, in my office or at my house, and that I would discuss any topic that concerned him.

If I met a man on the street whose face was familiar and yet whose name had escaped me, I gave myself no peace until I had run down the name and captured it. I used every device possible to widen my acquaintance and in every natural way to come into personal contact with men. I attended every student gathering to which I was invited, I spoke to students whenever I had a chance, I went to parties every week and I went out to dinner until my wife advised me to buy a meal ticket and have it punched whenever I took a meal and so save on board. I recall now that one worthy member of our faculty—I have no doubt that his record kept by the recording angel is much freer from blots than my own—took me to task rather seriously for attending gatherings of undergraduate men where smoking was permitted because, as he said, my presence there gave sanction to the evil practice and so was distinctly an immoral influence. Well, possibly he was right, but it certainly gave me a wonderful chance to meet men and talk to them when they were their natural selves, and I am afraid I have never been very penitent over the dereliction. Whenever I went among the men I kept my mind on the situation and made an effort to learn the names and affiliations of as many individuals as possible. Consciously I began to form associations

which would help me easily to recall the names of the men whom I was regularly meeting. Whenever we came together on the campus, I spoke to the men whom I had previously met and called them by their names. It was a help in time to learn their first names and even the nicknames by which most men are familiarly known about the campus.

I had at times had a little hesitancy about calling a student by his first name even when I felt that I knew him well. Von Bergen came in to see me one day and after we had finished our conversation he turned to go.

"Come and see me again, Mr. Von Bergen," I said, in a friendly way. "I wish you'd call me Von," he said, hesitating a little. "You call our other fellows by their first names and it would seem more friendly if you'd do the same with me. And so from that time on, I called him "Von."

I found out very early that the one who is looking for information of any personal sort will never get it from the undergraduate by asking him questions. If you want to find out what an undergraduate thinks or knows, don't ask him anything directly; simply look pleasant and interested—not too interested—and let him talk, and if you have time enough to give to him he will tell you everything he has ever known or heard, and best of all he will be quite unconscious that he has done so, and give you credit later for being a wizard. If at any time, however, your curiosity gets the better of you and you begin to ask questions about any details which he may be presenting to you he will at once grow suspicious and shut up as tight as a clam.

It was not long after I came into my office that I found I knew a good deal more about undergraduate conditions than I had ever before suspected. I soon came to understand how the town was being run or being allowed to run itself rather. I became familiar with gambling and drinking and prostitution and realized how little the ordinary city government does or seems to care to do to prevent or to control any of these things. I have seen a good many mayors, and I have known not a few chiefs of police, and I am forced to say that in general they are satisfied not to go too deeply under the surface of things, but to be content if the external appearance of affairs indicates that conditions are normal. The longer I live the more I am impressed with the indifference and the inefficiency of officials in our cities, and with the impossibility of getting much done through their co-operation. What I have been able to accomplish has been done for the most part through knowing and working with the individual student concerned and not largely through getting at the source of the evil even when it was quite clear what that source was.

I got rapidly acquainted with living conditions and where these were bad, I did what I could to change them. This changing of living conditions in a city of moderate size where the population is congested and where everyone wants to live within four blocks of the campus, is not as easy as it sounds. Young fellows would often rather live in an ill-kept unsanitary house near the campus than move to a better and often a cheaper place a half mile farther away. But it has been possible even under these conditions, through criticism and advice, materially to improve living conditions. I could have done little, I am sure, had I not known personally the fellows concerned.

Until within the last few years nothing had been done either by the college or the two towns properly to take care of those who were ill, and especially of those who were ill of an infectious disease. The college had no provision for such care; the towns assumed no responsibility. If a student contracted smallpox, for instance, as was happening constantly, the only possible disposition which could be made of him was to shut him up in a filthy, one-room sty without toilet facilities

built by the city on a dump heap just outside of the city limits and let him find such attendance as was possible to pick up. This condition of affairs seemed all right when you didn't know the man concerned, but when the sick man was a fellow you were acquainted with, it was a condition not to be endured. When I had been through about three of these experiences it was clear to me that the University should have an isolation hospital to take care of infectious cases, and it now has one, pleasantly located, wonderfully comfortable, and immaculately clean. The previous condition had existed because it had been no one's especial business to change it; no one had had the personal touch with the undergraduate who became seriously ill, who went through critical surgical operations, and who sometimes died without any college official seeing him or knowing much about him. For the past twenty years there has not been a surgical operation on any undergraduate man that I have not seen or known about. Every day I either go to the hospitals myself or send someone from my office who gets for me the information I want with reference to the people who are ill. No other one thing, I think, has brought me into closer and more sympathetic personal contact with students than this interest in the men who are sick. They seldom say much, but they do not forget nor do their parents.

There were a good many undergraduate customs which were foolish or vicious or detrimental to the good name of the institution, like hazing, for instance, which everyone deplored, but which it has been no one's business to correct. It was in fact difficult or impossible to correct them without knowing the source; and without being acquainted with the individual student it was impossible to know the source. It took time—ten years in fact—to eliminate some of these, but the elimination came gradually as one gradually learned who was likely to be at the bottom of things and got at him personally.

One of the most foolish customs extant when I became Dean of Men was the custom of the freshman and sophomore classes posting proclamations—vulgar, exciting documents they were—all about the town. This was done shortly after college opened. The placards appeared in the most impossible places—on third story windows, on the roofs of houses, on public buildings or sidewalks, on telephone poles and everywhere conceivable. There was always a clash of the two under classes and a row with property destroyed and somebody hurt. It was not easy to locate the actual perpetrators of the deed for they stole out of their houses after midnight or just before daylight when most decent people were in their beds and “billed” the town. I did know the student leaders, however, and these I called one day in autumn just before the time when an undergraduate outbreak might be expected.

“It's about time for the fall crop of proclamations to appear,” I said to the president of the sophomore class. “The practice is hurting the University, and besides it has in it a considerable element of danger. It ought to be stopped.”

“Yes, Dean,” he replied politely, “of course you know I don't have anything directly to do with it.”

“Possibly not,” I replied, “but you know or can easily find out who has to do with it. You are the president of the class, and the thing won't happen without your consent. I wish you would call it off, for if the proclamations are posted this fall, I shall have to hold you and the other class officers personally responsible.” There was no trouble that fall, and there has not been since. It was the personal touch again that won.

To get into touch with any group of young fellows, one must have sympathy for them, he must understand their problems and their temptations, he must have real interest in them, he must have a young heart at least even if he has an old

head. He must remember, also, that the hearts of young people are pretty much the same as they always were even if customs are changing and the habits of young people seem to him very different from what they were when he was himself young. We are shocked sometimes at what seems to us the frivolity and the utter frankness of the young person of today upon what were to us a generation ago rather delicate and private topics. The amount of dancing indulged in at the present time, for example, is positively shocking we often feel. In the comely neighborhood in which I lived before I went to college, no young person who wished to lay claim to respectability either danced or played cards. We often tell our young people so now, and with no little virtuous pride. We did other things quite as foolish and quite as reprehensible, however, because the conventions of our community interposed no objections to them. We must remember all these things if we are to get on well today. Infinite patience, unwavering faith, and at least an average knowledge of human nature are essential.

We read a good deal about fraternities these days and opinions are expressed pretty freely, especially by those who know least about the matter, as to the evil influences of these organizations. As for myself, I believe in the Greek letter fraternity in college and can say that its influence at the University of Illinois has been a good influence. We have sixty or more, national and local, and I am personally acquainted with most of the men in each one, and know pretty intimately how the fellows live and what their habits are. During the year I usually manage to eat at least one meal in almost every fraternity house about the campus and frequently I visit the houses more than once. I try to get acquainted with every fellow in each of the houses I visit and to make each of the members know me a little better. If it were not for this custom which these organizations follow of inviting me to their houses, I should have a much more difficult task than I now have of knowing each particular fraternity man.

The reason that the moral and intellectual irregularities of fraternity men are stressed so strongly often unjustly, I am sure, is that a man in an organization is not allowed to suffer for his own errors. Every man in the organization suffers and what the one man did the organization must pay. If a fraternity man drinks or gambles or fails in his college work, the blame is not placed upon him individually, but upon his fraternity in particular and upon all fraternities in general. The facts are that the principles upon which fraternities are founded are high principles; most of them as I know them are drawn directly from the teachings of Jesus Christ, and, if followed, would recreate every young fellow's life. The same is true of the doctrines of the Presbyterian Church of which I am an unworthy member, but I should be the last to blame upon the weaknesses of the church all the irregularities of its members.

It has been thought by a good many people that the fraternities which draw their membership from the ranks of a certain church are for this reason the safest. I have not found it so, nor have they been the ones longest to endure. The choice of men was sometimes limited, the type of man from which a selection could be made was more uneven, and his social qualities not always so pleasing. Ultimately every fraternity I have known composed of men exclusively from one church has either broken down, or broken away from its church affiliation and become national. There is to me nothing discouraging in this.

I have said so much about fraternities because it is through fraternities and organizations in general that I have been able, as the numbers increased beyond anyone's expectations, to keep in touch with the individual quite as well as was possible when the number of students was less than half as great.

I am not always in good favor with every campus organization. Often my decisions are very annoying to some of them, and not infrequently their request must be refused. Then, for a time, they will have none of me, and my very name is anathema.

"I don't like your methods or your system," a fraternity man said to me not long ago. "All right," I said, "that's your privilege, and I'm only human, anyway. I'll make an agreement with you, however, if you wish," I continued. "If neither you nor any member of your fraternity will come to me for the rest of the year for help or advice or request for privilege, I will agree not to interfere with your fraternity or to call any member of it during that time." He thought the proposition over for a while and then shook his head.

"I don't believe that would be a good trade," he said. He was right; if you make yourself useful or necessary to people, they will bear a good deal from you.

Most of us find it easy to preach to a crowd, but it is contact with the individual that ultimately counts most. Throughout the years that I have been a university officer I have spoken regularly every week to groups of men at one place or another. Sometimes, perhaps, such talk carries home; but the most effective work that I do is where the man and I are face to face across the desk from each other or sitting side by side, each with a chance to tell what is in his mind and heart.

In an article in a recent number of the *Atlantic Monthly*, Charles M. Sheldon in discussing this same subject says:

The average church committee seeking a man for a church, wants a man who can draw a crowd. The church is looked upon as a place to go to, to hear some one. But people want something more than preaching. They want comfort and courage and help that does not come to them when it is handed out wholesale. A whole Sunday afternoon given every week to the Open Door, established as a church custom, might in multitudes of churches prove to be worth more than all the pulpit ministrations and all the machinery of multiplied organizations.

I wonder, as the years flow down the channel of Time, why I have put so much emphasis on the pulpit, and so little on the people in my Parish. God forgive me if I have thought more of my sermons than I have thought of my souls.

And his experience has been mine. Whatever influence intellectual or social or moral that I may have exercised during the years I have worked with students has come not through contact with the crowd, though I have had that constantly and regularly, but through sympathetic personal touch with the individual. For years I have been in my office pretty regularly six days in the week for at least eight hours a day. Anyone is free to come and see me there, or, if he prefers it, at my house after dinner or on Sundays. And they do come by the hundreds. They bring the petty inconsequential things that can be decided or settled in a few moments, and they bring the things the settlement of which may make or wreck a life. There is no monotony and no two days are alike. There are the stories with which you are all familiar—the struggles with poverty and temptation and sin, and discouragement where faith must be strengthened and courage awakened and self-reliance developed, and opportunity discovered; there are the stories of love and disappointment, and each one of these problems is to the man who brings it real and vital.

"I don't suppose you've ever had any case just like mine," the man begins, and he is right in a way, for no two cases are ever quite alike.

My paper is perhaps already long enough, but I cannot bring it to a close without giving you two or three illustrations of just what this personal relationship with undergraduates does bring to one.

The telephone rang one Sunday afternoon just as I was settling down for a little rest after a long hard week. It was Doctor Bennett's voice that spoke when I took down the receiver.

"Could you run over to Romine Street and see Ferguson this evening? He has a good deal on his mind, and he would like to talk to you."

I had known Ferguson since his freshman year, and he was now a junior. His father was a hard working minister in a little country town in Illinois, and the boy had been forced largely to look after his own support. He was a good boy at heart, but easily influenced.

He was lying in bed when I entered his room, and I could see that he was laboring under an intense excitement.

"Tell me about it," I said, sitting down beside him and taking his hand. It was a halting story he told me, but a story as old as the race. He had been tempted, he had yielded, and he had contracted a dangerous disease that it would take years wholly to eradicate.

"I can't be taken care of here," he said, "and I can't afford to go to a hospital. I'm afraid to tell father, for he wouldn't understand, and he'd throw me out. I started to kill myself this afternoon, but I'm afraid to do that." And then he burst into tears.

We talked it over for a long time; we considered first one plan of procedure and then another only to reject them all. There was really only one way out and that was to tell his father, and I finally won his consent to let me do this, though he was sure it would be useless.

I waited until after the time of the evening service before I called up the boy's father; I had never before realized what a cold inhuman means of communication the long distance telephone is until I tried that evening to talk sympathetically over it. But my message and my explanation got through and the father was a game one. He met the situation without faltering and traveled all night and was waiting for me when I got to my office next morning. He had a good heart, but he was a poor hand at subterfuge. His chief concern was how he could explain to the neighbors without giving the real facts away, but he and I, two perfectly respectable Presbyterians, worked out an explanation that was both truthful and effective. Father and son were never before so near together as they were when they went home next day to find mother waiting for them at the station. The story ends happily, for the boy got well and came back to college and graduated and is now a successful and respected practicing physician.

Carter entered my office a few weeks ago rather bashfully. "I want to ask you some questions," he said, "and I hope you won't laugh at me." I promised him that I should be as serious as I was capable of.

"I'm going to a formal party," he continued, "and I've never been to one before. The young lady has been to ever so many and knows everything about what is conventional, and I don't want to seem a rube to her, so I thought I'd ask you how to act and what to wear."

It was a serious matter, I could see, so I did not smile.

"I could have asked the fellows at the house," he explained, "for a lot of them know, but they would have kidded me and given me a lot of bunk so they could laugh at me later, and I was sure you would tell me the truth."

I would not have played him false for a king's ransom. I brought out my store of sartorial knowledge and we discussed at length, white vests and black ones, long tails and tuxedos, pumps, kid gloves, bow ties, and how to get in and out of a room without damaging the furniture. We got quite chummy before we were through, and I loaned him a fancy vest to make his outfit complete. On the

evening of the party he walked six blocks to show me the shirt he was going to wear for at the last moment he had sinking of heart because he was in doubt as to whether he ought to choose a stiff bosom or a soft front. I looked him over and passed him on as perfect and was assured later that he didn't make a slip and that a good time was had by all.

About Thanksgiving time last year, Jim Easton, a big, husky freshman was waiting for me when I got back after luncheon.

"Well, Jim?" I asked when we were seated across from each other.

"Did you ever run away, Dean, when you were a kid?" Jim interrogated.

"No, I never did, Jim," I answered, "but I planned to do it more than once, and I wanted to like the dickens though something always happened to prevent it."

"Well, I can't stand it much longer," he went on, "and unless someone locks me up or ties me to a telephone pole, I'm going to pull out of this. I know I'm a fool, but that doesn't help any."

We didn't reason it out; it was no use. We just talked it over. Jim didn't realize that his having told me how he felt would be very likely to prevent him from yielding to his feelings. I exacted from him a promise that before he ran away he would come in and tell me, and I agreed that in such a case I should do nothing to prevent him. He is still sticking to his job.

Anyone who works with a constantly changing group of young people must often lose heart and grow discouraged, and ask himself if he is really getting anywhere. Would I take up the work again if I were back at the crossroads where I stood twenty years ago and were given a chance to choose? I wonder.

I had a call from Hunter two years ago. Hunter had been graduated ten years and had been in all parts of the world in his practice of engineering. He was a rough, ill-trained undergraduate with a good many questionable habits, and we had had not a few interviews before he got out of college. If I had ever made any impression on Hunter, he gave no indication of it. If I had done him any good, it was not evident.

"I have often intended to write you," he said, "but I'm careless about writing and I never got round to it. You thought that you made no impression on me while I was in college, and I meant you to think so, but it wasn't true. I simply wanted to give the impression that I was 'hard boiled.' I've been up against all sorts of temptations, but I've really kept clean. If you ever have a tendency to get discouraged and to think that we aren't influenced by what you say, don't yield to it. It is all worth while and the fellows don't forget."

And this last story I tell you for your encouragement.

DISCUSSION

DEAN GOODNIGHT—How do you get in touch with those students who belong to nothing, go nowhere, or never have any trouble?

DEAN CLARK—There will be a few such students who will never ask for a privilege, a concession or for help, who never violate a regulation. There is practically no way of establishing a contact with them. One of the men in my office is called the Assistant Dean of Men for Freshmen. He requires every freshman to come in to see him.

SECOND SESSION

The conference was again called to order by the President, Dean Bursley, at 2 p.m., April 24, 1924.

Dean Effinger, of the University of Michigan, was present and for President Burton welcomed the members of the conference to the University in the following address:

I hope that any speech from me or any words from me in this matter will be unnecessary. I hope that anything I may say is only a physical expression of what you feel to be a welcome from the University of Michigan.

Personally, I have some interest in this group of men because, before Dean Bursley came to you, I had these functions to perform and a number of other things and I have been gradually getting rid of some of these things and Dean Bursley has helped in one respect, but I think I know of the many, many problems you men have to deal with. I know of course that all Deans of Men are expected to have the wisdom of Solomon and the craft of Ulysses and there is no limit to what you are supposed to know.

I do not think there is a more serious problem before us, those of us interested in university education, than this problem which you men are attempting to attack in its various phases, but I do think that there is a tendency to over-estimate what is called the student problem. I do not believe that the student body is as hard to manage as it is thought to be. Personally, I feel that in spite of the fact that Dean Bursley has not taken me into all of his affairs and I do not know what is going on in his office, I am perfectly willing to say that I do not feel very pessimistic about the American student and there is nothing that we cannot change or improve if we go at it in the right way.

I feel privileged to be here and hope to learn a lot in the minutes I spend with you this afternoon.

Dean Nicholson, of the University of Minnesota, responded to Dean Effinger's address of welcome, as follows:

Dean Effinger and Visiting Deans: To us visitors it has been a great pleasure to come to the University of Michigan for this conference.

Michigan may be called the mother of our modern state universities. She has been the pioneer in many of the progressive steps in the past. Her schools have been known and looked up to by the ambitious young collegian since the beginning of most of our western universities.

Most of us here, particularly those from western universities, remember that it was the ambition of the young prospective lawyer as well as others, to be able to get to Michigan for at least a part of his work. It seems to me especially fitting that this group of deans should meet here for the consideration of their problems, which is pioneer work, in that some recognition of the problems by universities and systematic efforts to solve them are still in the pioneer stage.

It gives us great pleasure to be here, Dean Effinger, and to receive your welcome.

Dean Bradshaw, of the University of North Carolina, read a paper on

PERSONNEL WORK AND VOCATIONAL GUIDANCE

If so uneducated an official as a mere dean of students may indulge in some discussion of educational theory I would like to begin this statement by calling attention to an apparent and widespread change in educational ideals which explains, clarifies, and indicates the subject-matter of this discussion we are beginning. Higher education has begun to re-establish its contacts with life and to recognize its obligation to deal with the whole personality of the student. It is recognizing that it must be practical in the broadest sense of that word and that it must be not only intellectual, but physical, moral, and social as well. Into this current of educational thought there is flowing the sense of the insufficiency of mass education unsupplemented by individual attention to individual differences and the application of the scientific method to human behavior and relationships. From the effervescing depths of this very interesting educational ferment there bursts forth almost hourly new bits of program, new educational officials, and new pieces of technique.

The recognition of the educational value of student extra-curricular activities, sectioning on basis of ability to progress, restricted admissions, appointment of committees on educational research, these are familiar to you all and will serve to illustrate the thing I am talking about when I mention the new bits of program. It is yet early in the day of academic revolution but I think that already these bits are falling into some general types or classes and that the administrative devices adopted for their furtherance may be included under three general types—Deans of Men, Personnel Directors, and a new type of academic deanship. Deans of Men are springing to arms all over the country and their general functions were brought out in the morning discussion. Personnel offices have become well established at Dartmouth and at Northwestern. Examples of the new type of dean-ships are to be found at Minnesota, Chicago, and Harvard, where the academic deans have been multiplied in number and their duties have been given the widest possible scope. As yet these three types of office overlap at many points and yet differ sufficiently to be distinguished in function as well as in title. What the final administrative organization shall be rests with the *laissez faire* of time. We might make many interesting predictions. For instance, I am inclined to think that twenty-five years from now there will not be any Deans of Men. However, that is not my part of the program and I leave that along with the academic dean-ships in the hands of those who are accredited leaders of strictly academic thought, which we certainly are not. The purpose of this diversion is to get rid of the idea that personnel work, including vocational guidance, is something jerked into this program. It is a necessary result of the educational development which brings us here today.

“Successful personnel administration consists in making effective and satisfying adjustments between men in their work” (*Journal of Personal Research*). Its point of view is the belief that failure is the result of maladjustment, that this can be diagnosed and corrected by scientific methods, and that this can be done most effectively by an office unprejudiced by being a regular part of the academic machinery. The measures designed to accomplish the making of this adjustment as worked out in various universities fall naturally into three main divisions, selective admission, educational and vocational guidance, and placement or follow-up.

1. *Selective admission*—I am using this term to cover not only those purely restrictive standards erected to limit admissions to those capable of receiving

higher education but also the gradually spreading practice of securing from entering students an increasing mass of information to be used later in guidance and research; such for instance, as family history, preparatory education, interests, extra-curricular activities, books read, vocational preferences, father's and mother's education, family physician's estimate of health, educational plans, and all sorts of biographical data. I may say in passing that this sort of thing seems to me to be of far more significance than the various restrictive qualifications now in use in some institutions because it will give us some day adequate information on which to base such restrictions. I doubt if we have adequate information at this time. We have not yet done much along this line at North Carolina. Those interested in the details of this practice will find very full information in the blanks used by the University of Chicago and Northwestern. Others present may know of other institutions which have well-developed practices of this sort.

2. *Educational and vocational guidance*—A complete outline of a program of educational guidance would include many things so familiar to us all that I will leave them with only a mention of their existence. Such devices are the various plans of advisers, psychological tests, etc. Two outstanding innovations would seem to demand some discussion. The first is the use of the mental hygiene expert. Psychology is now claiming to be a therapeutic science. Many institutions are offering their students the privilege of psychoanalysis or some form of individual psychological analysis and advice. Individuals whose behavior would seem to indicate some mental or emotional disturbance are referred to experts in this sort of treatment. This enterprise is well established at Dartmouth where a visiting consultant comes in at stated periods for his service. With us a graduate student works under the direction of members of the psychological department. Dartmouth reports genuine and valuable results. We are still in the experimental stage. I know other institutions are trying this plan, but I do not know enough about their present practice or experience to justify mentioning them by name. The second plan deserving mention is vocational guidance. The power of the vocational motive in getting the student to do his best work is becoming recognized. The lack of such motive in the body of undergraduate students is a matter of common experience. I believe that experimentation with this form of personnel work is very general the country over. It is taking two main directions, assembling and making available to students information about vocations and experimentation with various forms of tests and individual analyses as a basis for giving vocational counsel. The latter is universally conceded to be a fruitful field for experimentation, but I doubt if it is more. It should not be ignored in any vocational guidance program, but I will leave it with no further discussion here.

The assembling and distribution of vocational information to students is definitely under way in many universities. Probably the best known are Dartmouth, Leland Stanford, and Minnesota. The program generally involves a library bookshelf of the best works on the various vocations of interest to college students, statements from the heads of departments as to the vocational fields open to students majoring with them, descriptions by leaders in the various vocations of the nature of their work, compensations to be expected, personal qualities and education needed for success, courses in vocations, addresses on the importance of giving careful thought to vocational choice and the principles of choice, organization of groups of men interested in the several vocations to study their field and their educational needs, the arrangement of interviews with those having vocational knowledge and those interested in getting it, development of opportunities during the college year and summer work for try-out jobs, etc. Our own beginnings this

year, very modest, illustrate what may be accomplished with a limited budget and in the first year. They are as follows:

PURPOSE

To furnish interested students such information concerning vocational opportunity as will enable them to make sane decision.

GENERAL METHOD

1. Assembling literature on general subject of vocational choice and on the nature, requirements, and opportunities of different vocations.
2. Making occupational surveys of this state and section.
3. Organizing corps of vocational counselors from various departments of University.
4. Working in collaboration with the director of psychological research to assist students in self-analysis.
5. Presenting matter of vocational choice and the services of this bureau to students through public lectures, articles in college publications, and by individual conferences.

SCHEDULE OF WORK

1. Prepare and use a supplementary matriculation card, furnishing among other facts the student's preferred studies, vocational choices, vocational experiences, self-help status, father's occupation, parents' education, and extra-curricular experience.
2. Organizing and giving mental alertness test (Otis General Intelligence).
3. Made some preliminary analysis of the vocational elements in the freshman class as shown by supplementary matriculation card.
 - a. Number choosing all occupations.
 - b. Names and courses taken by those making no vocational choice.
 - c. Names, course, and choice of occupation of those inconsistent.
 - d. Relation between father's and son's vocation.
 - e. Proportion of self-help students choosing various vocations.
 - f. Those in each vocation who had earned money.
 - g. Relation between preferred studies and vocational choice.
 - h. Proportion of sons of college trained parents in each vocation.
4. Made duplicate cards for all books on vocational choice catalogued in University Library.
5. Wrote 36 publishing houses for booklets on vocations.
6. Sent out 150 form letters to universities, bureaus, and organizations, asking for information as to their work in this field, for bibliographies, any publication describing their work, suggestions and general information.
7. Some personal letters to leaders in various fields, asking for information regarding nature, requirement, and opportunities in their respective fields.
8. Studying and filing material received.

THE NEXT STEPS

1. Organization of group of faculty advisers from various departments, who will give time to students seeking information as to opportunities in their fields.
2. Building up shelf of reference books either in this office or in library.
3. Study of intelligence tests as compared with vocational analysis of freshman class.
4. Scheduling talks on vocations to freshmen and others who care to attend.
5. Study of census reports as to vocational needs and opportunities of this state and section.
6. Publicity in student body as to service bureau can perform and the way they can avail themselves of it.

NEXT YEAR

1. Continuation of studies.
2. Enlargement of service.
3. Development of placement of graduates.

3. *Placement or follow-up*—No industry can be assured of permanent success that does not see that its products reach market and that their reception by the market is made the constant basis for modification in production practices. One of the elements in the apparent inertia of educational thought is undoubtedly the difficulty we have in checking up on the success or failure of what we do to the students while they are with us. The Bureau of Educational and Vocational Guidance should be, and is coming to be, interested in placing graduates and in studying

the results of such placement. So far as I know no definite results are yet forthcoming. The state universities have been slow to enter the placement field. I think it should always be made clear that no placement is guaranteed, but at the same time I do not see any reason why we should not take every opportunity to place students if we can.

You will notice that I have made no attempt to answer the question of how much personnel service the student has a right to expect of the university. It seems to me that the educational concept that lies at the bottom of all our offices implies that we shall offer to the student all the personal service that is worth anything. However, there is a question that is not so simply answered; who or what office shall be responsible for the development of this service? It is my belief that the office of Dean of Men should be in supervision of such work because that official has the human, non-technical point of view that will keep it sane and because he has the touch with the students which will commend to them this new form of educational and vocational guidance.

DISCUSSION

DEAN BURSLEY—While we have done very little work at Michigan up to the present time we are just now trying to work out some scheme for something of that sort. We have a committee which is working on the matter and we expect a report soon. I personally believe that the work of vocational guidance should be very closely associated with the office of the Dean of Men. I do not mean that the Dean of Men should do all of this work, but I believe that the men who have the actual contact with the students should be attached to the office of the Dean of Men and that should be one of the qualifications of the office. The policy to be followed might well be laid down by the Committee on Vocational Guidance, passed by representatives of various departments or colleges, the execution of that policy to be in the hands of those men who are attached to the office of the Dean of Men. There might be as a member of that committee some professional expert in vocational guidance, because that is going to be more of a specialized form of work and I know that I should not feel that personally I was qualified to act as an expert at the present time. I think that personal guidance is one means of coming in contact with the student body and think for that reason and no other that this work should be associated very closely with the office of the Dean of Men.

DEAN McCLENAHAN—The conference may be interested in one matter which we are trying out at Princeton, to which a slight reference was made by Mr. Bursley, namely, the aid that we are getting in psychiatry. We are getting money to carry on researches and we hope soon to begin this work. I think we were the first to undertake this work for abnormal students.

DEAN RIENOW—One point which has not been mentioned here, but on which I would like some information. Most universities now through the co-operation of the Dean of Men have done a great deal to eliminate poor students. We like to feel that we are not keeping the poor student in college. Each semester and frequently during the semester our committees with due solemnity pronounce sentences of execution. We say to the student that we have been patient, he has studied hard, we have had conferences with him and he says he has spent four hours on this and three hours on that and has gotten nowhere. He has been told that he is a bright student and his high school superintendent has advised him to go to college. We had a student come to us. He failed every single hour of his work during the first semester and yet he had been told by seemingly intelligent people that he had unusual talents and that he should not "waste them on the

desert air." There he was a wreck, he did not know what to do. If there is any place where vocational guidance is going to come in it is going to be in such a manner that we will do something besides justify this point in a negative way. We are simply passing the problem on to another part of our state. I think we ought to be in a position to say to a boy, you are not a failure. He is misguided and misdirected and we should be able to direct him along certain channels where we have every reason to assume that he may be successful. What are we going to do with the subnormal boy who is caught in the jam, who has been urged on to a higher education?

DEAN CLARK—My own experience has not been the same as some of the conclusions which have been reached here. I think some of the reasons for failure come from the fact that men are working their way. I would say that perhaps fifty per cent of the men who work their way fail because they have not the physical strength to do two things at once. Perhaps fifty per cent is too high. I think a large number of failures come from the fact that the parents are very anxious that their children should have an education. I think there are a few subnormal students in college. The thing I think the college man does need is a definite purpose. The next thing that I think he needs is interest in what he is doing, and the third thing, willingness to work. I think ninety-five per cent would do well if they had these three things. Too many are taking courses because their fathers did not have a chance to be doctors, or lawyers, or engineers and they are determined that their sons shall do all the things that they did not have the opportunity to do. If we could instil purpose, interest, and willingness to work into the minds of students I believe we would drop very few students. Too many students are asking "What is a good course to take in college?" Too many are looking around for the thing which they can do most easily. I think that students should do the thing that they are fitted to do.

DEAN ENGBERG—Dean Clark said exactly what is in my mind. My big problem in dealing with students in the past has been to try first to find out what they were interested in and see if they were headed in the right direction, but sometimes a student gets an idea that he wants to do a certain thing and nothing on earth can change him, but that is not so difficult as trying to convince his parents because if he has set his heart on doing a certain thing he must do it and should not be denied; or perhaps it is the parents who have picked the course. When we find that a student comes with earnestness I believe in trying to look for a place in college for him.

DEAN RIENOW—My experience has been similar to Dean Clark's, that in this great rush of students that there are only a few able to do college work. I believe that if a census were taken of every institution represented in this room you would find hundreds and hundreds of students are dropped without a single word of advice as to what they were fitted for. A good many believe that it is the proper thing to do whether they have the ability or not. I am not able to tell a boy that he cannot do mathematics, but he can do this. Our tests have shown that ninety per cent of the students who are in the lowest ten per cent, on a basis of these so-called intelligence tests, draw ninety per cent of the failures. It is true perhaps that ninety per cent of these men put on probation need not have been there. I am discussing the type of student who is where he belongs, namely, a flunker. We must establish a piece of machinery which will help these boys to find themselves. We should not say, "You have failed, you are a failure," if a boy can make good in business, or other lines of work. We ought to be able to give this boy some positive advice as to what his line of work should be.

DEAN NICHOLSON—I am very much interested in this problem because it is one that has called for a great deal of thought and work at Minnesota. We are dropping students at the end of every quarter, freshmen, sophomores, and occasionally juniors. Some years ago the problem was merely as to whether the student had failed to pass satisfactorily in a set amount of his registered work. Now every effort is made to determine the cause of failure so far as possible. These will be immaturity, too heavy a burden, due to physical condition or finances, wrong objective, and last, unfitness. The first means that the student should be returned to the care of the parents; the second is to be handled so that the best interests of the student may be served; the third is frequently difficult to differentiate from the last, and for that reason calls for great care and consideration. We are attempting to give this combined group careful study and determine if possible whether the student might not have possibilities in some other college where such a possibility appears. The student is transferred to that college indicated. There has not been a one hundred per cent success attained and I am not prepared to state that it has reached fifty per cent, but numerous examples of great success might be given. In my judgment, based on my experience, the number to be properly classed in the last group—mentally disqualified—is very small.

Dean Coulter, of Purdue, presented a paper on

HOW CAN STUDENTS BE STIMULATED TO GREATER AND MORE INTELLIGENT INTEREST IN PROBLEMS OF THE DAY

This is a perplexing time in which we live and the subject assigned me would seem to indicate that conditions, even in our universities, do not augur well for the future. I would be more disturbed at the implications involved in the title were they not such hardy perennials. I do not expect to live to see the day when the world is not facing the greatest crisis in all history. The world seems to have the habit of facing crises. Neither do I expect to live to see the day when we of the elder generations are not confident that civilization is going to rack and ruin because of the thoughtlessness and frivolity of the young.

It is comforting to have assurance that there is a sure remedy for these disturbing conditions. In *A Late Harvest* former President Eliot says, "Every sect or religious organization, and every state or nation seems to need more intelligence, more vision, and more sense of duty toward the high call of honor and conscience. There is but one road upward—more education, and wiser."

This is simply one form of expressing the profound faith in youth and education which is perhaps the most deep-seated and universal characteristic of our citizenry. For, some way, there is a universal belief that education trains men and women for citizenship. It would all be easy enough if we could satisfactorily define education and citizenship.

A day or two after reading Dr. Eliot's essay I was speaking before a group of bankers. At the dinner following the session the conversation turned upon the value of certain phases of the school work in the city in which we were meeting. I ventured to ask the chief critic of the schools how he would define education and what in his view its end product should be. Without hesitation he said, "The purpose of education is to so train the young that they will be able to earn a living." I was silent, but wondered if our work was to be measured in such terms. A little later there was some discussion of the life and character of a man who had recently died. One said, "Whatever his faults, we must all admit that

he was a good citizen." And then I asked, "What is a good citizen?" The answer came as swiftly and with as much certitude as did the definition of education, "A good citizen is one who earns his living and pays his debts."

I imagine these answers expressed with fair accuracy the prevailing conception as to the function of education. Then I reflected that about ninety per cent of the people of the United States spent so much time in earning a living, that they had no time to live. They were so occupied in this task that they make no contributions to their generation and did no constructive work upon which future generations might build. The other ten per cent may be considered as the "saving remnant." At any rate in them lies the hope of the future.

I wondered whether after all education did not have for its purpose training to *live*, to live the abundant life. Whether after all our universities were not something other and higher than mere trade schools. Whether, indeed, if in them men and women were trained to live, a living would not become an incident instead of an end.

In our national and community life, even in our educational institutions, such emphasis is placed upon material prosperity as a measure of success, that it is little wonder that students are more interested in those subjects which will increase their earning capacity than in those which will enrich life. Until this atmosphere is changed, in attempting the solution of this problem, we are fighting against the powers of darkness in high places.

Concretely, and in the sinuous and tortuous fashion in which all Deans of Men have to work, I have tried out the following plans with a certain measure of success. The measure of success attained was directly proportional to the degree in which the students felt that they had originated the plans and were carrying it out. That is where the sinuosity comes in.

The various fraternities for several years had been having a series of fraternity talks by members of the faculty. These talks were wholly unorganized and their character varied with the caprice, or digestion or intellectual *flair* of the speaker. Here was a weapon ready to my hand. I had long realized that random talks to small groups of students, however brilliant, however valuable they might be, could not appreciably affect the morale of the whole student body. That in some fashion "mass" results must be secured. I therefore called in the officers of the Pan-Hellenic Council to discuss these fraternity talks. During the conference I suggested with apparent casualness that it would be interesting to try out having all of the talks on a given evening upon the same subject. A few days later, a committee of the council came to me with the plan worked out in detail and asked my approval. On the day upon which the talks were to be given, the speakers lunched together to consider the points which should be emphasized. The first subject was "Law," apparently not especially exciting as a subject and yet one which worked out amazingly well. The point agreed upon for emphasis was to get over the idea that law was protective and not restrictive. That law never prevented a man from doing anything he ought to want to do. From the general, down to the particular, even to the Volstead Act and alleged personal liberty the path was easy. Forty groups of students, averaging thirty men each, heard those talks and had taken part in the discussion. It became a matter of campus conversation and even found place in the columns of the college daily.

The next subject was "Honesty." The antecedent preparation was the same in this case as the former as far as the speakers were concerned. From the significance of honesty in governmental and in business matters it was easy to work down to the little problems which confronted the individual student. Naturally this led to the question of dishonesty in university work and the aftermath of this

talk was that it was resolved to study the whole question of student dishonesty from the angle of the student and from that of the faculty. Two committees are now at work collecting material from which they hope to be able to draw conclusions which will serve as the basis for remedial recommendations. This will serve to indicate what I meant by "mass" results. Thirty men talking about a given subject do not attract much attention, but when twelve hundred or more are all talking upon the same subject and comparing notes, conditions begin to change.

The success of the work with the Pan-Hellenic Council led to a search for other agencies which could be utilized for the same purpose. Obviously "Debating Teams" and "Forensic Clubs" were divinely instituted to aid Deans of Men. A tactful suggestion to these young dialecticians that they should let their light shine upon the campus instead of shedding its beams upon benighted institutions in other communities met with an immediate and enthusiastic approval. I arranged for the various teams to meet all sorts of organizations, even going so far afield as the Y.P.S.C.E. and Epworth League. We first tried out "Resolved, that the United States should immediately enter the League of Nations." It worked, and worked so well that I had to restrict the number of engagements of the various debating teams. Probably a good deal of the work was sophomoric, but very many students knew more about the League of Nations than they had ever known before, and could more intelligently appraise the attitude of the United States in regard to it.

Our Department of English by its series of public readings has proved a great help and is drawing increasing numbers of students.

I presume that if we stimulate students to a greater and more intelligent interest in the problems of the day it will be because we are ourselves intensely alive to their real significance.

Our institutions are already too large to hope to accomplish any very considerable results by personal contacts. Not only are our institutions great but they are rapidly growing in numbers so that the day of personal contacts is nearly done, and the days of touching and stimulating the student body "en masse" are already upon us, and this, Mr. President, is the way in which one Dean of Men has attempted to answer the question carried in the subject assigned.

DISCUSSION

DEAN FOSTER—For a number of years the Y. W. C. A. has sponsored discussion groups. We have thirty-seven local and national fraternities on our campus. Thirty-five out of the thirty-seven are willing and anxious to have these discussion groups in their houses and there are now as many more groups outside of fraternities. In all, several hundred men have been getting the benefit of these discussion groups. The leaders in most cases are faculty or graduate men. The range of subjects is pretty wide. It includes national questions and international questions. The discussions last from 6:45 to 7:30. When the Bok Peace Plan came up we thought that a great number of votes would be cast on our campus and we felt that the students should understand the pros and cons of that proposition since they were going to vote. Our students took it up with a great deal of enthusiasm. Here is the point it seems to me. All we need to do is to bring these young people in contact with these ideas. They are ready to respond just as soon as we get them in contact with the ideas.

DEAN MELCHER—At the University of Kentucky Dean Boyd assigned eighteen professors to deliver lectures. We called them matriculation lectures. He asked these professors to talk on the subjects which were within their range. They

claim to have gotten very good results from these lectures. These were for the freshman class only. In the upper classes ten groups have been organized. One professor was to be at the head of a group of fifteen and they were called conversational groups. Each professor in his department would prepare three talks and I believe the result has been very satisfactory.

MR. TURNER—We had our Y. M. C. A. discussion groups and they were successful and we heard them talked about on the campus. Go into the fraternity houses and you will find around the fireplace students smoking and talking. What will they talk about? First of all, things on the campus and then they will go on to problems of a more serious nature, maybe law, or some problem of the day and they will talk it over. I know students are interested in all these things. We have one crowd which is interested in the social side, but that is a small crowd.

DEAN FOSTER—There are over one thousand men every week discussing the same problem.

DEAN RIENOW—We have a dormitory which houses three hundred and fifty men and I started discussion groups in the dormitory on Sunday afternoon. This was not successful at all because the men who were invited by the students to go there thought they had to be serious. One man should have talked on the modern languages of England and instead he went over and told them how to write an English composition. Naturally he fell down. This year we have assigned the subjects to the speakers and out of three hundred and fifty there will be two hundred and fifty on a Sunday afternoon.

DEAN CLARK—We had a series of English readings on Tuesday night for an hour. I am always sure that there is never going to be anybody there and I always say so before I go away from home and yet the room is always full at every one of these readings. We have all-university afternoons once a month on Sunday. Unfortunately, we can see only about one fourth of our student body, but the place is full and often people are turned away. Then, too, we have Sunday 'afternoon organ recitals which are very largely attended. I am amazed at the number of people who go to church and listen to the things that are being said in the churches. Our daily paper a few years ago had a discussion on the lack of interest. We do not allow our athletic activities to be run on Sunday, our tennis courts are closed, and our golf course is closed, and the paper stated that there was nothing to do on a Sunday, that there was nothing to do but play poker and billiards so I had a canvas made of the churches and 3500 of the undergraduates were at church the next Sunday. The student goes to church because he wants to go to church. I do not feel that we are all going to destruction as fast as we can, not going as fast as our ancestors are going or as fast as we ourselves are going.

The President, Dean Bursley, appointed the following committees:

On nominations for President for next year—Deans Goodnight, Heckel, and Field.

On place of meeting for next year—Deans Nicholson, McClenahan, and Hubbard.

Dean Bradshaw presented an invitation from the University of North Carolina to hold the meeting there next spring.

The Conference adjourned at 5 p.m.

From 5 to 6 p.m. the members of the conference were taken for a very enjoyable ride about the city and country clubs. At 6:30 the conference was entertained at dinner in the Michigan Union, followed by a smoker at the University Club, by the university.

There were no speeches called for, thus enabling everyone to meet and enjoy many new friends.

THIRD SESSION

Friday, April 25. The Conference was called to order by the President, Dean Bursley, at 9:45.

The first paper presented was by Dean Nicholson, of Minnesota, on

THE RELATION OF THE FRATERNITY, GENERAL AND PROFESSIONAL, TO THE UNIVERSITY

In attempting to consider the relation of the general and professional fraternities to the university, it is necessary to give consideration to (1) the ideals and standards set up by these fraternities in their constitutions and obligations, and (2) the standards and practices under which the individual chapters actually live and operate.

From the standpoint of ideals and high standards I doubt if there is any general fraternity (recognized by the Inter-Fraternity Conference) which does not undertake, through its constitutions and obligations, to demand of its members, that they give whole-hearted loyalty to their country, their college, and their fraternity; that they, in their selection of new members, seek men who give promise of character and ability—in other words, men who will represent manliness and clean living; also the ideal that the chapter and the chapter house will represent a home for the out-of-town boy where he will have from the older men the best of big brotherly advice and guidance; that this guidance, advice, and service will be such as will develop and strengthen his individuality, his possible points of strength, will find and teach him to guard his weaknesses, and promote his regard for good scholastic standards. In general, the fundamental ideal is that of service to the individual, the group, the fraternity, and the college.

In the case of the professional fraternity we find the same ideals, and, in addition to them, the further ideal that no man may become a member until he has shown actual promise of becoming a useful and valuable member of the profession represented, that there is to be promoted and developed an atmosphere of professional interest and *esprit de corps*, which shall result in a raising of professional standards both in college and in practice.

This, I believe, fairly represents the ideals and purposes of each of these two general college organizations—ideals which are set up by these fraternities, but which, like all human ideals, fall short in accomplishment.

Reviewing some of the facts of practice as we see them in our everyday life—the loyalty to country, university, and fraternity is there, but it is not an ever active, aggressive loyalty. It is rather a dormant loyalty which is only brought to the front by some overt act or word and then becomes fiercely militant, but which, as soon as the particular occasion has past, is laid away to rest until a new set of conditions again arouses these emotions. In other words, it is an intermittent emotion and not the steady thoughtful loyalty of the ideal.

Let us start with the beginning of the new school year with the selection or pledging of new members.

As soon as the freshmen arrive there is, in most colleges, begun immediately an active, intensive rushing period. Those freshmen who are to be considered and bid, are loaded down with attentions and entertainments. Their attention is centered on the excitement of their new college life, and not on the problem

of adjusting themselves to this life and its real responsibilities. As a result we have a high mortality among freshmen pledges. The basis for selection of these freshmen is not that of knowledge of capabilities and promise of sound manhood, but rather that of appearance, social aspirations, and social graces.

After pledging, the majority of chapters make some effort to see that pledgees keep up their work, as in many of the colleges there is now some scholarship standard for initiation. After initiation there is a let-up in the scholastic control and there begins a consistent program to see that freshmen get into activities, into offices, and make a show in the social competition.

Individuality, independent thinking, or expression which is not in conformity with the customs or does not meet with the approval of the student group is frowned upon and discouraged.

The chapter and chapter houses do not serve to replace the home, as in most chapter houses habits of carelessness are allowed to develop which would not be tolerated in the home over which a mother presided.

There is frequently in a chapter house at least one man who does not observe fraternity ideals in regard to intoxication, gambling, or women. The policy of non-interference with others allows them to create in the group an influence detrimental to those who are newly absorbing the lessons of fraternity conduct and standards. (This condition will frequently give a public bad name to a chapter when, as a matter of fact, the great majority of the group personally, do not stand for such things.) The repression of individuality and of the expression of strong personal views makes possible this creation of undesirable reputation and influence, by minorities, and also frequently by alumni who use the house improperly.

In spite of words to the contrary, the freshman becomes imbued, by acts, with a chapter loyalty which overrides college and general fraternity loyalty. There is developed an active social competition which means rapidly mounting expense, due to the desire to outdo and outshine competitors.

There is the tendency to live too much within the group instead of in the community, problems and interests are considered in the light of the interests of the group instead of the university. The above applies to both general and professional fraternities which receive freshmen. A large number of the professional fraternities do not take men until the close of the freshman year, many not until the close of the sophomore year. In these cases there is opportunity to know their men and their prospects, though with the rapidly increasing number of professional fraternities, the standard of selection on merit is gradually lowering.

The professional fraternities are gradually approaching the general fraternities in organization, mode of life, and purpose. They are rapidly acquiring houses and beginning the social life with its competitions, thus introducing many of the problems from which they have been free in the past.

In general terms the idea of true service to the individual, the group, the fraternity, and the college is lost sight of in the stress of the life of less important matters.

I am not trying to draw an indictment against fraternities. I am trying to record facts as I see them.

In the case of the ideal fraternity or chapter, there can be no question of its value to its members or the college, for the positive values of active thought and service for its members and the college far outweigh any criticism which may be made. In the case of the fraternity or chapter as it actually exists and functions, the value of its relation to its members and the college is such that it opens the way to much criticism, both just and unjust.

Are these fraternities, as organizations, or their members, alone responsible for the difference between the ideals which they put forth and the actual condition under which they operate? Is not this wide difference between the ideal and practice a fair reflection of the condition existing among those outside of the student group, those from whom the students are unconsciously receiving their impressions and lessons? Is not the relation between the student group and its immediate world, the college, comparable to the relation between the mature citizen group and the country, the state, or the city? Are we older men any more prone to put into actual practice the ideals and to give much more than life-service to the obligations which many of us have accepted?

It is too much to expect these men, as they approach the threshold of citizenship, to be far in advance of the generation ahead of them, in a realization of their responsibilities and a clear understanding of their obligations and opportunities.

In attempting to measure the difference between the ideal and the actual relations of the fraternities to the college, fairness demands that the relation of the college to the fraternities be considered. Have the colleges measured up fully to the opportunities open to them by these definite organized groups?

Until within recent years the college has not taken the fraternity seriously as offering direct responsibilities, also opportunities. They were accepted as a necessary evil, in some cases to be bitterly fought, in other cases ignored, entirely missing the fact that boys as well as men have always arranged, and will always arrange themselves in more or less well-organized groups, and that, depending upon the character of the guidance and direction they are given, they may become productive forces for good or evil.

Within the last few years colleges have recognized that these organized groups possessed potential powers for good and have been undertaking to direct these forces into constructive channels. The studies of fraternity scholarship have succeeded in advancing scholastic standards materially and have aroused the scholastic ambitions of chapters and the general organizations, at least, to a degree much in advance of what they have been.

We all know that it very rarely happens that a chapter is found in which there is not one or more men who, if sought out and encouraged, develop a leadership which may shortly change the entire complexion of the chapter.

We know now of the possibility of directing the energy, loyalty, and thought of an entire student body by arousing the loyalty and enthusiasm of these small organized groups. We know it is possible because we do it occasionally. That we do not do it oftener or to greater advantage, is possibly our fault.

We feel that these groups are not living up to their possibilities in exerting influence upon individuals who need help and guidance. But do we not make frequent and successful use of individuals in these groups, and often of groups themselves successfully to guide and help individuals whom we find needing this guidance and help. The right spirit has been there all of the time—it only needed mature direction to point the way and the need.

The alumni group of these organizations offer a large field for developing interest and co-operation. To my mind the colleges are largely responsible for whatever weakness there is in the relation between these fraternities and the college. It must be largely through their initiative that closer contacts are built up and better guidance established. In accomplishing this condition, to what extent should we depend on official legislation and to what extent depend on the creation of friendship and good will? In the same measure as we succeed in answering this question will the relation of these fraternities to their colleges improve.

Following Dean Nicholson's paper, Dean Johnson showed a series of charts upon which he had displayed the curves representing the average scholastic standing of the students in the Colorado Agricultural College who were pursuing courses in Home Economics, Engineering, and Agriculture.

The first series showed the curve of those who had had from none to four years of modern language in their preparatory work. The distribution showed that each of those groups furnished scholars of the highest standing as well as those who were not qualified to pursue their studies farther. While there appeared to be some slight advantage to those who had had modern language it was not diagnostic in character, and therefore could not be considered as an entrance requirement which really separated those who were qualified to do college work from those who were not.

Another series of charts showed what had been accomplished by those who were permitted to present for entrance credits subjects which they had pursued for less than a full year. The curious result came about that those who had been permitted to use three or four such fractional units had a more successful college career than did those who did not present such fractional units, or those who presented too many. The curves again showed that there is nothing peculiar about these subjects which determine whether or not such students are qualified to do college work.

The third series merely showed the average made by students who entered college with a conditional unit to make up, those who had just sixteen units, and those who presented more. No marked difference could be discovered in the averages made by the people of these groups.

The results of these studies merely showed that we have not yet discovered infallible criteria for entrance to college, and perhaps never will.

DISCUSSION

DEAN COULTER—We found that the so-called honorary societies were not honorary. Tau Beta Pi, a scholarship society, takes 10 per cent of the senior class. The first three men in the list were not selected, eight, ten, and eleven were not selected, forty-nine, fifty, and fifty-one, were. Fifty-one was the lowest. Those from the top were not taken. The answer was that not merely scholarship, but general personality were taken into account and now we are considering the proposition of making honorary societies on the basis of scholarship. We were asked to print on the commencement program those who had been elected to honorary fraternities, who had achieved these fraternities by scholarship. We felt that we wanted to classify fraternities and recognize those which were trying to be honorary.

DEAN NICHOLSON—We draw a line between honorary and professional. Honorary classification means that the faculty has a responsibility with the students.

DEAN BRADSHAW—I would like to know how other institutions reward those who have accomplished some valuable work. Why are they not as deserving as someone who has been elected to Phi Beta Kappa. If he has made a distinctive contribution he should be awarded some form of insignia.

DEAN HECKEL—For many years Phi Beta Kappa was based purely on scholarship. It was found to be unsatisfactory. We had one instructor in college who never "flunked" a man and we found that every man who made Phi Beta Kappa had been majoring in this department. Now those who have 95 or better are automatically elected to Phi Beta Kappa. This year we took in two who were below 95, one a debater, editor of the paper. We decided he was one of the most valuable and contributed more than one who received high grades. Another

man, manager of the *Annual* had been a member of the Council and in his sophomore year had been injured in a class rush. In view of the fact that he was an outstanding man he was admitted.

DEAN CLARK—I presume I talk too much. We have certain honors at Illinois which we have developed recently—one, a freshman society. If men are taken into this society they wear a distinctive key. The membership is purely automatic. The faculty decide what the percentage will be. All of those men will have their names printed and will all receive recognition from the University indicating that they have been honored by the University. Perhaps the upper three per cent in the various classes will be given a button, or something that they can dangle on their wrist. Juniors and seniors will get buttons, freshmen and sophomores will get only recognition. In Phi Beta Kappa the election is made by the society as a whole on recommendation of a committee. List is made of fifteen per cent of the class. The committee recommends a certain number of those. That is, if there are forty the committee will probably recommend twenty-five or more. We never take the total number. A man may be elected with a considerable lower percentage of grades than a woman because of the fact that women, either because of their alertness of mind or their psychological appeal to the powers, get an average of about four per cent more than the men do and so if we went on a purely scholastic basis Phi Beta Kappa would be largely a feminine organization. We do occasionally select an outstanding man whose average is a little lower than that required, but when it comes to actual voting we have a ballot which everyone is to check and there is a good deal of free and open discussion of individuals.

DEAN BRADSHAW—We have a regulation that prevents the society from becoming entirely feminine. A certain proportion of the women are eligible and a like proportion of the men are eligible and in that way the society cannot become one-sided. An outstanding man or woman as recognized by the society may be elected although below the standard. A candidate who falls below, but who is proposed by the committee must have a unanimous vote.

DEAN GOODNIGHT—Regarding honorary organizations which are springing up in very great numbers, is there any unfortunate experience with them anywhere, is there any reason why we should attempt to check organizations of these various natures?

DEAN HECKEL—I think they are dangerous because they are administered on the basis of scholarship. We have so many of these organizations that I think something should be done to stop their establishment.

Dean Hubbard, of the University of Texas, next presented a paper on

**WHAT, IF ANY, SCHOLARSHIP REQUIREMENTS SHOULD BE
ATTAINED BY FRATERNITIES BEFORE THEY ARE AL-
LOWED TO INITIATE NEW MEN, AND WHAT SHOULD
BE THE SCHOLARSHIP OF THE PLEDGES BE-
FORE THEY ARE ALLOWED TO BE INITIATED**

The regulation of fraternities as regards scholarship, at the University of Texas has passed the experimental stage. The policy of the University of Texas in this regard has been thoroughly tried out and has proven so successful that there is no agitation of any sort in regard to abolishing the regulations. The movement started in the winter of 1913, when the non-fraternity students presented a petition to the faculty to do away with fraternities. This petition reached the faculty in January, 1913, and the faculty appointed a committee

to consider the matter. Later in the spring this committee made its report, which embodied the following provisions: First, no student could be initiated until after he had completed four courses of regular work counting for a degree. In the case of transfers from other colleges who had completed their freshman work, such students could be initiated at the end of the first term of attendance, provided they had passed twelve hours of work during the first term, otherwise they were to be subjected to the yearly rule applied to freshmen; Second, any member of a fraternity or sorority who failed to pass twelve hours of work in any term was required to move out of the house and to stay out until he had completed a subsequent term of satisfactory work; Third, in the case of freshmen who became eligible at the end of the year, they could not be pledged before the fifteenth of the following September.

The fraternities asked that these regulations be amended as follows: "First, that fraternities be allowed to pledge eligible freshmen on the third Wednesday of May of each year, provided, that any bid shall lapse in the case of any pledge failing to make the required four courses in the spring term; Second, that the scholarship rules regarding those boarding in fraternity houses be removed, retaining the rule only as to roomers therein."

The Faculty Committee, after careful consideration, decided to reject the second proposal, but recommended to the General Faculty the first proposal in the following form: "Eligible freshmen may be pledged on or after the third Wednesday in May, provided, First, that any invitation shall lapse in case the pledge fails to make the required four courses in the spring term; Second, that there shall be no rushing of freshmen whatever in the fall term, and that any rules made for governing rushing during the winter and spring terms shall meet with the approval of the Committee on Fraternities and Sororities." The faculty accepted the proposed changes in the form in which they were presented by the committee.

The session of 1913-1914 was the first year during which the new regulations operated, and at the end of the year it was apparent to all that certain changes would be necessary in order to make the new regulations practical. Therefore, for the session 1914-1915 the rule regarding a closed season of pledging freshmen was discarded and it was decided that the rule requiring fraternity members to move out of the houses for poor scholarship should be changed to read as follows: "No chapter of a fraternity, sorority, or like social organization shall initiate any person to its membership unless the average scholarship of such chapter, both as to amount of work passed and grades made, shall be slightly above the average of the University, excluding courses particularly listed as open to freshmen. Chapter validity in this matter of initiation shall be established during one long session and hold good for the following year. Chapter invalidity may be removed by the fall term's work, the establishment of such validity not to be claimed before February 15th." This regulation went into effect in the session of 1915-1916.

As amended, the Texas Plan then is practically as follows:

1. Before students can be initiated into fraternities, sororities, or like organizations, they must have passed in one long session at least four courses of regular work counting for degrees, or four and two-thirds courses in one long session and the subsequent Summer School. Students coming from other colleges shall be subject to this rule, except that those credited here with at least four courses toward a degree for work done during their last year of attendance at the institution from which they came may be initiated on the completion of twelve hours of work during the first term of attendance here. If, however, they fail to complete twelve hours of work during the first term of attendance here, they must comply with the first provision of this regulation.

2. No chapter of a fraternity, sorority, or like social organization, shall initiate any person to its membership, unless the average scholarship of such chapter both as to amount of work passed and grade made shall be slightly above the average of the University, excluding courses officially listed as open to freshmen. Chapter validity in this matter of initiation shall be established during one long session, and hold good for the following year. Chapter invalidity may be removed by the fall term's work, the establishment of such validity not to be claimed before February 15th.

The reason for including in these regulations what may seem the peculiar provision that the fraternity average must be slightly above the University average was to prevent any effort on the part of the fraternities who came within a few points of making the University average to insist that they be not declared ineligible. As the matter has worked out in practice, no group that has equaled the University average has yet been declared ineligible. At the end of the first year three fraternities and two sororities failed to make the average, and were consequently declared ineligible, but during the following fall term the two sororities and one of the three fraternities raised their average sufficiently to become eligible. This left only two fraternities ineligible during the session of 1916-1917. Since then the number has varied, but in no case has any group been forced out of existence at the University of Texas because of the scholastic regulation. Except in rare instances it has happened that no fraternity or sorority has stayed on probation more than one year at a time. In nearly every instance the group declared ineligible at the end of one year has become eligible again at the end of the first term of the following year.

The following conclusions have been reached in regard to the Texas Plan of Scholastic Regulations of Fraternities: First, the administrative officers of the University feel that these regulations are the most important that have ever been passed regarding student life, and that under no consideration would they be willing to rescind them; Second, the scholarship of any group is a safe ground for action as regards regulation, since scholarship should be the primary consideration of any student or group of students attending college; Third, that the evils of fraternity life are largely due to the immaturity of the members, and for that reason any stressing of scholarship among these members is certain to have worthwhile results; Fourth, the practical working of these regulations has resulted in a material raising of the academic standing of the various groups and it has made scholarship a permanent issue with them. They consider carefully the scholastic record of possible initiates in their high school work and the prospects of these students in doing good work in college; Fifth, the sororities have adhered to the regulations and have accepted them in a better spirit than the men; Sixth, in order for scholarship regulations to be effective it is necessary to give the various groups an opportunity of going over the averages before they are made public in order that any objections may be considered and explained beforehand; Seventh, the publication of the scholastic standing of the fraternities constitutes a public record of merit and this is the only official recognition given them by the University; Eighth, political activities and social exclusiveness among the fraternities and sororities has lessened; Ninth, the scholarship regulations have helped to make the fraternities more responsible to the needs of the University and to student life as a whole.

DISCUSSION

DEAN COULTER—Our trouble begins in the sophomore year and we have a higher percentage of failures in our sophomore class than in our freshman class. I have spent a good deal of time studying the fraternity problem and have been

attacking it this year from a different angle. I have found that we have about 40 per cent of our men in the fraternities and I have found that 40 per cent of our men give us about 70 per cent of our absences. At the end of the first three weeks of the second semester I called for a report of the members absent. I found that seven out of forty-one had had a perfect attendance during those eighteen days.

I might say that we have a women's Pan-Hellenic, but the sororities offer us no problem. The women's sororities for eleven semesters headed the list. The men's fraternities for the same length of time have constantly held the lowest.

DEAN CLARK—We have found it exactly the same, that scholarship and attendance are directly related. I would say that 95 per cent of the men who are dropped for poor scholarship are irregular in their attendance and I believe that their poor scholarship is dependent upon that. Our fraternities do not cut more than the others do. The people who come next to these two classes are the men in private dormitories who have no supervision. They will take the prize. We had this rather interesting experience in the fraternity scholarship regulations. They are all made by the fraternities themselves. We had a regulation that no one may be pledged who is not on the campus and so far as I know no one has ever been pledged except in one case. A man may not be initiated who has not passed eleven hours of work and not until the second semester. He may not be initiated then unless his average is three or above and his fraternity has an average of three or above. A fraternity whose average is below three may not initiate a man unless his average is three or above. Very small percentage of men fail to be initiated. A man may not live in the house unless he meets the requirements for initiation. Some fraternities have a standard of their own. We began to take an interest in this in 1909, to publish the scholastic averages, and to stimulate them to make rules for this. The fraternity average was 6.23. Last year the average was 3.25. This is the highest and we have been pretty close to it since the war. There is a good deal of interest in scholarship among the fraternities and students in general. The cry is that fraternities are raising their standards and that it is hard to pass an examination. I have heard it twice a year for many years. A man who goes to class regularly almost always passes and in most cases passes well. It is the man who has so much to do that he cannot get to class that does not pass the examinations.

DEAN ARMSBY—I have been making a chart for the last five semesters of attendance and grades, allowing one point for each fraternity and local club. Everyone lines up in a straight line. The more absences, the lower grades. Our regulations are that a man must pass twelve hours to remain in college. Fraternities voluntarily adopted a rule that they would not initiate a freshman until he had passed eighteen hours, which is 50 per cent above the college requirements for remaining in school. The school has never adopted this rule. In every fraternity freshmen have the highest rank of any group in the house without exception. After they are initiated they slump with the rest of the chapter. Some fraternities have adopted a fine for members who "cut" classes.

DEAN RIENOW—I have a feeling that we have been wasting too much valuable time on fraternities. I do not believe for a minute in fixing any regulation which says to a fraternity you may not initiate a man until he has passed so much work, you may not have a freshman live in your house. I want to see the time come, and in fact it is with us, when I can say to a man, "If your boy has a chance to go into a fraternity let him go into it." We have more trouble with people in rooming houses where fellows "burrow" with no supervision. In other words, as the institutions grow in size it is foolish for us to think that we can know every

single boy in our college or in our fraternities. We cannot know everyone in college and we should not waste time in trying to do this. Why are we having trouble with our sophomores and our juniors and not with our freshmen? The freshmen pass their work and then they proceed to "flunk." We say to the fraternities, "We do not care when you initiate or whom you initiate, he may be Catholic or Jew, Democrat or Republican, that is up to you," and we are finding now that they are beginning to investigate their men because they know that they are getting either an asset or a liability. Then we say, "If you do not get men who are equal to the average of the University we are going to put you on probation." They have one year to get on probation. They know that their standing depends upon the group. I see no objection to pledging men not on the campus. I would not be in favor of pledging while in high school. A rule was sent out by our high school superintendent and in courtesy the Inter-Fraternity Conference took it up and decided that they would not pledge men while in high school. We have notified superintendents such action had been taken and solicited their co-operation and asked them if they found that any man had been pledged to a fraternity to notify us. We have had no notices and so we assume that it is working out. So far as pledging during the summer is concerned, we find that it has shortened our rushing season and so attention is centered on scholastic work. Fraternities have organized the study table so that freshmen may be inducted into methods of study. We tell them they must not leave their bills over until the next year, and they are put on probation if they are not paid. We tell them that they may not initiate any freshmen or have any freshmen live in the house. I do not want to see freshmen live in dormitories. I believe fraternity houses are conducted as well as any state or privately administered dormitories. Our fraternities have a higher scholarship than the average of the men in the university and they have a higher scholarship than non-fraternity men and the group men have a much higher average than the non-group men. These rooming house people are in it for the money there is in it. A woman who has fourteen roomers in a house and has no other income is not going to tell you that one of them came home drunk. I find that our men in the fraternities are living better and more wholesome lives and the effect is better than on the men outside. I find that men in these groups are enforcing regulations which we could not enforce as regulations of the University. A majority of our fraternities do not initiate a boy until he has passed all of his work with a higher grade than C. Scholarship is not a cause, it is a result, it is a barometer.

The meeting adjourned for lunch.

FOURTH SESSION

The Conference was called to order for the afternoon session by the President, Dean Bursley, at 2 p.m.

Dean Ripley, of the University of Arkansas, read a paper on

ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS FOR EXTRA-CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES

If I had been asked a year ago to discuss this question I could have given some very good advice, but after one year's experience as Dean of Men I am sure of only one thing and that is, "The Dean of Men earns his salary."

One thing at least interests me as I consider this problem. No matter what I may think or write here the question will not be settled. This is indeed a stimulating factor. I am not foolish enough to think that I can settle it and I am not wise enough to tell you how to settle it. Only as time adds experience may we hope to approach a solution through elimination and trial. I have some rather positive views on this problem at present but this does not mean that these views will not change with experience gained through observation and student contact.

In discussing this problem I first desire to outline what it includes as I see it and second to give reasons for the position I take. I shall place extra-curricular activities under two groups. The first group includes those activities in which students represent the university publicly and the second group includes those activities in which no public appearances occur. Right here I desire to add that I do not believe that the two groups should have the same eligibility requirements.

Colleges are more and more allowing credit for those activities where the student represents the college publicly but I do not know of any college that is allowing credit toward a degree for the second group. If it were not for the problem of eligibility I would strongly favor placing the first group with our regular courses but at present I see no good way to do this.

If we are going to give credit towards a degree for football, debating, etc., would it not be best to treat these subjects the same as mathematics, chemistry, and history? If we did not face the problem of eligibility I would answer "Yes" to the above, but when we see where we would be led, especially in football, if we did not have rules of eligibility I must say "No" to such a grouping. It appears that only certain things in college curricula bring up this eligibility question. If we could be more certain of uniformity among our colleges in dealing with these extra-curricular activities this might help us to solve the problem, but with conditions as they are today it is evident to all of us that some rules are necessary, and especially so in athletics. Only by strong rules on eligibility here can we hope to uphold the moral tone of our colleges. I must confess, however, that I am not decided upon what is best. From the standpoint of courses that deserve and receive credit toward a degree I see no reason why one course should have different eligibility requirements than another course barring prerequisites, but when I think where this would lead us under present conditions I know I am wrong and I see there must be certain eligibility rules for certain courses. If we could limit our eligibility requirements to our extra-curricular activities for which no college credit is allowed the problem then would be much less difficult. If

there was even an agreement between colleges as to how we would group these activities it should be easier to agree upon our eligibility requirements.

About two years ago a committee from our senate took up the problem of extra-curricular activities and after some time submitted the following report:

1. That the senate go on record as favoring a policy of not granting college credit for extra-curricular activities except those that can be provided for in regularly organized classes.
2. That as a means of giving a suitable form of recognition, an official record be kept of all students who participate creditably in certain student activities which require special abilities and are open to student competition. This record shall be compiled each term by the executive secretary to the President, reported to and approved by the senate, after which a suitable entry shall be made on the student's individual record in the registrar's office.
3. We recommend that these forms of student activities shall be: University scholarship, prizes and awards, election to honor societies, participation in intercollegiate debate, honors won by stock-judging teams in competition with other colleges, positions of special importance and responsibility in student publications, special military honors won while members of R.O.T.C., winners of letters in football, baseball and track, or any distinguished service to the University.
4. That the present method of allowing college credit for athletics be continued for the present with the provision that the total amount of credit be limited to nine hours, and that the maximum amount of credit allowed be limited to one hour per term for which the student must be regularly enrolled, including the customary excuse of football men from military drill (without credit) for the entire year.

This was made as a recommendation to the senate by the committee and was never acted upon by the senate.

As in most reports of this kind, there is always added at the last a clause which leaves everything unsettled. This committee in defining the student activities for which recognition shall be made ends under 3 above with "or any distinguished service to the University." Thus we are left to decide what extra-curricular activities shall be classed as "distinguished service to the University."

This committee "fought shy" of eligibility requirements, making no report on this phase of the problem.

In our pamphlet "Information for Students" under Rules of Eligibility for Public Appearances we have the following rules:

1. A student to be eligible to take part in any extra-curricular contest or performance to which a public audience is invited, such as the Glee Club, dramatic performances, readings, recitals, debates, athletic contests, etc., must be making a passing grade in at least 12 hours in a regular or special course of study in the University; provided that students giving exhibitions in the University buildings where no admission fee is charged, if such exhibitions are a part of the work of any department and under the supervision of an officer of the department, shall not be subject to the rules governing public appearance. Members of the staffs of student publications must meet the requirements for public appearance.
2. Any member of an intercollegiate athletic team who is, at any time in the season, found to be making a passing grade on less than 12 hours of work, shall receive a warning, and if at the end of two weeks thereafter he is still passing in less than 12 hours of work, he shall not be allowed further participation in intercollegiate athletics in that season.
3. No student may take part in a public performance as designated above until the Registrar has issued a certificate that he is eligible under the rules. In the case of intercollegiate athletics, this certificate shall be issued one week before the first contest; in the case of all other activities it shall be issued not earlier than one week before the date of the public appearance, or before the date on which an organization leaves the University to give performances elsewhere.
4. Any person who is charged with the management or supervision of any performance coming under the head of public appearance shall hand to the proper official of the University, not less than one week preceding the date of such public appearance, a list of all students who are expected to take part in such performance, and he shall not permit any student to appear who has not been declared eligible by the proper official.
5. The Senate Committee on Athletics is in charge of the enforcement of the rules of eligibility for taking part in intercollegiate athletics. The Dean of Men is in charge of the

enforcement of the rules of eligibility for all other public appearances, in so far as men students are concerned, and the Dean of Women in so far as women students are concerned.

6. It shall be the duty of any executive officer or teacher in the University to report to the Dean of Women, or to the Dean of Men, or to the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Athletics, or to the Discipline Committee such cases of violation of the rules of eligibility for public appearances as may come under his notice.

CREDIT FOR STUDENT ACTIVITIES

1. College credit is granted only for those activities that are conducted as regularly organized classes, e.g., intercollegiate debating, football, baseball, stock-judging, band and such activities as are listed for credit in the catalog.

2. Credit in athletics is limited to nine hours for any one student and will not be given for any activity unless the student is registered therefor.

Taking these up in order I do not feel that it is exactly fair to place the members of the student publications under the eligibility rules when they are allowed no credit for their work. It would seem that these activities should be classed with the second group and should have different rules of eligibility. Especially do I think this true of the position of editor-in-chief of the college annual. This work has become so heavy in recent years that unless the instructors show mercy the poor editor-in-chief will do well if he passes half the normal number of hours required of students.

In order that a fair degree of uniformity may be secured in dealing with the rules of eligibility, I believe they should all come under one person or better still under one committee but, as in our own case, this is not done, so I am informed, in many colleges.

I am beginning more and more to believe that the second group of activities for which no credit is allowed will to a large extent take care of itself. As in life we cannot expect all of our students to be interested in student politics to any great extent and while I believe it is good for all students to participate to some extent in these activities I also know that all cannot hold office and all are not fitted to do so. In the long run I believe we can rely upon our student body to serve as a very good balance wheel though we may expect fluctuations. I saw a very good illustration of this two years ago in our student body. One young man had worked up to a commanding position among the students. He tried to use his position for selfish purposes and not only was he defeated in the annual elections but every man he was pushing was badly defeated. It was common talk among the students that he received just what he deserved.

Every time we make a rule to cover some new problem that comes up we burden our already overloaded administrative work for we must at once be on our guard to see that the rule is not broken. I am not in favor of trying to get a rule for everything that comes up. I realize that we must have some rules but I want these a minimum and I also want them so definite that I know and the students know just what they mean.

I believe that encouragement should be given to all students to take part in most of the activities of college life but I do not believe that we should urge our students to devote their time and energy to these extra-curricular activities.

Education is an experiment as is also life and we must expect difficulty in trying to work out our problems, for the personal equation is so large a factor that there is not much else to work with. Students as a whole are very optimistic so that any thing they want to do is all right but anything we may do in the way of rules to govern them is all wrong. I believe a certain amount of freedom in student activities will go a long way towards developing not only self-reliance among our students but also a more friendly feeling towards the faculty.

How much good or how much harm may be done to a student in these extra-curricular activities I believe depends largely upon the disposition and character of the student. Some students are interested in the extra-curricular activities more than they are in the regular college work while others, and I believe the great majority, are interested more in their courses and take but little interest in the various activities. I doubt if we can ever hope to balance these two conditions fairly.

If we could have the opinion of many alumni over a long period of years we might be able to evaluate these extra-curricular activities and so determine what system if any is best in handling the problem.

I only wish I could give a solution to this problem but at present I can only say that I am in favor of having the two groups, of placing eligibility rules on the first group and of leaving the second group for settlement by the students at least for a few years. Time and experimentation may show us something better and then I am ready to change my views.

DISCUSSION

DEAN RIENOW—Football players are allowed credit, 6 hours of the 120 required for graduation, and do not have to drill with the R. O. T. C. First and second year men must take military training. War Department cannot excuse men for football.

DEAN GOODNIGHT—Drill is voluntary with us.

DEAN CLARK—The Military Department is a department of the University and the R. O. T. C. is run as a department of the University and we run it as we run any other department. I excuse from military drill or from physical training for the football season or baseball season. After the season is over the men go back into the drill. They get credit for the time they are playing on either the football or baseball team because they have done the required amount of physical work.

DEAN RIENOW—Do you require 120 academic hours to graduate?

DEAN CLARK—Engineers have to have 142 and the other classes 130. If a man is not physically able to take physical training or military training he must make up by taking some other subject.

DEAN GOODNIGHT—Can a man graduate with less than 120 credits of academic work?

DEAN CLARK—A man must have 130 hours. He may not have more than 10 hours of military training and more than 4 hours of physical training in the 130 or the 142. In fact, a very large majority have 4 hours of military credit out of the 130 and 2 hours of physical training. We decide how many shall be excused from these things.

DEAN RIENOW—Our commandant has agreed to decide this matter.

DEAN CLARK—Our commandant is not asked. The commandant asks me.

DEAN RIPLEY—The Military Department is a department of our University. The University physician passes on those who desire to be excused, but if a man does not drill he must make up in some other subject the equivalent of military drill. Football men are excused and can play football instead of drilling.

DEAN RIENOW—Instructions were obtained that commandant can excuse a certain number of men, freshmen; and athletic coach excuses men. On the basis of this report which was made up by our coach including Michigan, Minnesota, and other places our Committee on Physical Training decided that we would grant physical training to 30 freshmen and 20 basket-ball men. The commandant goes according to his recommendations from the War Department. Our University

requires that all freshmen in the College of Applied Science and Pharmacy shall take two years of military drill as a prerequisite for their degree. The only excuse being for disability. If you do this you have the privilege of excusing anyone you see fit as long as you do not go over 100 students. If 30 freshmen are excused to participate in freshman football this fall they may not again get into military training. The men on the football or baseball team are excused from practical work during the football or baseball season. We have another regulation that any student who is excused for physical reasons from military training does not have to make up his work. We require 120 hours, exclusive of military and physical training for graduation. No credit is given for military or physical training.

DEAN COULTER—The same eligibility rules as apply to athletics apply to all other activities, can have no conditions or delinquencies and must have good attendance record. Preliminary reports are submitted to registrar and Attendance Committee also. In regard to debating teams, no one can work on a debating team who has deficiencies of the semester previous, they have to have a "clean slate" when starting debating. No credit is given for any extra-curricular activities.

DEAN NICHOLSON—Students must be free of conditions or failures to be eligible. In the case of athletics this is of course enforced literally. In the case of our own campus activities there is a degree of flexibility. The rule was adopted primarily for the protection of student, so that frequently, a well-balanced student may have one condition or one failure waived. The student whose record shows weakness would not be granted a waiver of a condition or failure.

DEAN CLARK—No student on probation can take part in anything. No freshman may take part in dramatics. I think that the student opera has taken more time than anything else. No one who is on probation may take part in student athletics and no credit is given for any sort of activity. They may not represent the University in any way, class officer, or any activity, if on probation. Freshmen may take part in other things except dramatics.

DEAN GOODNIGHT—No freshman may participate in extra-curricular activities except those which are designed for freshmen such as athletics and debating. They may train with the Glee Club, but cannot take part in any public performance and have no representation on the Student Council. We have tried to be exceedingly scrupulous in regard to a degree. The terms of the degree are stated in terms of so many credits. The smallest number of credits in which a degree may be taken is the Arts course, 120. The military training is optional. A man may take 4 credits in physical education and 4 in military training. He is required to take 8 in one or the other or both, in addition to the 120 credits of academic work. No extra-curricular activity is accepted as credit toward a degree. A man may not participate in extra-curricular activities if he has conditions, failures, or irregularities. Fourteen hours is the minimum which a man must carry in order to participate in activities.

DEAN RIENOW—What would athletic coaches say if all freshmen were eliminated from the athletic field, if it were known that they are not doing good work? Many freshmen come every year and make a rush to our athletic field. They are not good students naturally. They are taken down to the football field on September 15 and are started in practicing. I think that football practice and a shower afterwards practically spoils the evening for study. They are encouraged in every way to take part in baseball, track, etc. I feel that a great many good students are ruined before they have had a chance. Have any of you been able

to say to a football coach, "now this man cannot go onto your football field this fall until these delinquencies have been made up?"

DEAN GOODNIGHT—With us our registrar has been on the job for a good many years and is statistical mathematician. He puts students on warning if they are on the ragged edge, admits them on probation if they are low in their work in high school and some he does not admit at all. Those who are admitted on probation he has kept a statistical record of and he makes this statement that of the number admitted on probation not more than half have ever made good toward graduation. All freshmen who are admitted on probation are automatically barred from participating in freshmen athletics. We have an examination the third week of the semester. All faculty members are required to report on delinquencies. Then at mid-semester we give the customary mid-semester examination. Those who have fallen down are debarred from participating in activities. Freshmen who have fallen down are sent for by the Junior Dean and are warned.

DEAN BRADSHAW—We have been unable to find any correlation between poor work in high schools and poor work in college.

DEAN BRANDON—We have two mid-semester examinations, one at the end of six weeks and the other at the end of twelve weeks. A student found delinquent at the end of six weeks is reported to the coach as ineligible and the coach withdraws his name from the squad. If we could get a report at the end of three weeks it would be better. Have tried getting a preliminary report based on the observation of the instructor at the end of two weeks, but have been unable to make this operate very well as instructor says two weeks is not long enough.

DEAN ARMSBY—No man on probation can play football. We get a report at end of every four weeks and any man, freshman or any other, who is passing less than twelve hours is barred from the athletic squad. Coaches are notified at once and student is taken off the field. If a coach has made up his team for a game and we get a report on Friday a student is not taken from the lineup of the next day's game, but he is not allowed to play in the next week's game.

DEAN McCLENAHAN—We have written tests at the end of four weeks. Any student whose work is not satisfactory at the end of that time is barred from activities until the time that the next test is given five weeks later when he may reinstate himself. If he fails 5 or 6 hours out of the 16 hours he is barred from athletics. He is notified and also the coach is notified that he is excluded until he has reinstated himself. In addition to that the freshmen are watched closely and any freshman who at any time is reported by his instructor as doing unsatisfactory work or his attendance is not satisfactory, is taken off of all activities until he improves in his work. The coaches are very careful to regard our warnings.

DEAN ENGBERG—A man must make twelve hours the first semester. We have a report on delinquencies and attendance every four weeks, again at mid-semester and then at end of semester. The coaches are notified and they tell a student that he is down in his work and he stays at home and gets caught up with his work and then goes back. The average grade of the athletes is a little higher than the grade of the other students. The same is true in other activities.

DEAN FIELD—We have a report from all departments every four weeks. The Standing Committee goes over the reports. The passing grade is sixty and if they place a man on probation he cannot participate in any of the activities involving a representation of the school, such as Glee Club, etc. He may practice football, but the coaches know that he cannot represent the team in a game. A man may be failing in one subject and be recommended to be put on probation in that one subject. This would not exclude him, but probation in two subjects would exclude him.

STUDENT GOVERNMENT—ITS CHARACTER AND EXTENT IN VARIOUS UNIVERSITIES

ROUND TABLE DISCUSSION

FRIDAY, APRIL 25, 1924, 3 P.M.

DEAN McCLENAHAN—It has been a very great pleasure to come here to meet these men who represent the institutions of this part of the country. I am very grateful for the encouragement which I have gotten. We are not as bad as I thought we were, judging from what I have heard you tell about yourselves. I find that the East and the Middle West have the same problems and are meeting them in the same way. I will outline some things which we have tried. Our system of student government has been an extensive one. It is based entirely upon the honor system in examinations. Since February, 1893, the honor system in examinations has been used and the examinations are entirely in the hands of the students themselves. A student committee is appointed and made up of representatives of all classes, but chiefly of the upper classes, to whom all suspected cases are reported by the students themselves or by members of the faculty. In the first set of examinations under the honor system in 1903 two upperclassmen saw an opportunity to get something for nothing and cheated. Two underclassmen also tried the same thing. A mass meeting of the college was held and it was the most enthusiastic and serious one I have ever attended there. A committee of seven was appointed and delegated to take up the matter and see what could be done. We met and considered all the evidence that was presented. It was the first time that the thing had been tried. We took the underclassmen and told them that they could go to their instructor and confess their guilt and ask for a new examination or leave college. The other two were put out. From that time on to now I say with the utmost confidence in the accuracy of my statement that the honor system has assured complete honesty in examinations. It is the most remarkable thing that we have had. If the system had done nothing else but substitute student supervision over faculty supervision that would have been a real accomplishment, but it has done something else for us. I believe that the honor system with us has toned up the whole University and has lifted the moral tone of the whole place. In 1914 or 1915 representatives of the Senior Council came to me and said that they would like to have some part in the discipline of the University. I said "if you are willing to accept the responsibility I shall be delighted to give you an official part in the government." They accepted this and we went ahead on this basis and they were granted authority. The first thing we did was to give to the representatives an official part in the control of the discipline. A Council Committee of three arranged to meet with the University on cases of discipline. They said, "if we go in there you will outvote us." I said, "not at all—you as representatives of the students will have one vote, faculty members, exclusive of myself, will have one and I, as Dean, will have one." The students decide what there is to recommend and they offer the first recommendation. I turn to them and ask them what their recommendation is. That is approved by the members of the faculty. The action approved is taken and the matter is settled. If the faculty disapproves then I have the deciding vote. In case I do not agree with either the Senior Council or with the faculty I may impose any penalty which seems wise and it may be entirely different from anything previously suggested. That relationship has worked well, it has strengthened the council very much, it has worked to their satisfaction and I regard it as a success. That was the second step in our student government. Later the Senior Council came to me and said "you have to deal with some cases of petty dishonesty.

You will have a boy copying from another man's work, you will find one man substituting for another in a college lecture. You handle these to our satisfaction, but we should like to handle them." They arranged a committee which is known as the Committee on Honesty. If cases of dishonesty come to me I turn them over to the Senior Committee. Most of the information comes from the instructors, sometimes from students, and that information is passed on to the Committee of the Senior Council. They consider it and report to me. The committee is made up of five seniors appointed from the Senior Council. This committee has considered all kinds of cases. They have imposed penalties and are very likely to deal more gently with a freshman than a senior. They recommend suspension and I execute the sentence. I have never known them to be too severe and I do not think they are too lenient. In this connection we had before us one day a boy who was accused of having stolen a fur coat. He came before us the most scared boy you ever saw. He could scarcely talk yet he told the most artistic tale of his whereabouts. He moved my sympathies for a time, but did not convince me. After he left the room the members of the faculty said "that man is innocent." The committee said, "you are crazy, all of you—he is guilty." Within an hour the man came to my house and confessed his guilt and that his story was all a lie. We went back in the evening and I reported the confession. Then the question came up as to what to do with him. I was for putting him out of college and having him go to work. The Senior Committee said, "this man is a senior and has been here for three years under the honor system." They said that he could never be trusted under it and he was dismissed from the University. There was a third step which was attempted at the request of the students themselves. I do not know why they took up the matter with me, but they came to me about a year or two after the second step. They said "there are many things which go on of which you know nothing, which are harmful to the University, and which, if you did know you would make them the cause of discipline." I said, "undoubtedly, even if I do have three detectives," and they said, "we would like to be able to handle these things by ourselves without reporting them to you. If we pass on everything we would be regarded as spies and we lose all respect, but if you will give us the authority to recommend penalties we should like to attempt these things." I went to the faculty and offered this recommendation and it was decided that the Senior Council be permitted to recommend without statement of cause, men who had been guilty of conduct which, in the opinion of the council, had been harmful to the good name of the University or subversive to the moral tone of the University. This recommendation provided that a man be informed that he had the right to appeal to the Discipline Committee of the University. This was approved by the faculty and has been in effect since 1918. Then I discovered later what the reason for this was. Four students, two juniors, a sophomore and a freshman had taken two young women to a dormitory, but there was no question of any immoral conduct. The Senior Council knew it and they said that the freshman was more of an ass than a goat. He and the sophomore were severely reprimanded and the two juniors were dropped out of college for a year. That represents what we have done as far as the students themselves are concerned. They co-operate splendidly and I cannot ask more hearty co-operation than they have given us and it meets with great success.

I have tried one other thing. It has been my practice to try to treat every student as if he were a man and not a school boy to be governed by regulations and restrictions. I got the faculty to adopt a measure by which the students were divided into six groups. The upperclassmen who maintain a certain standing of

the first and second group were rated in grades, one to five, a passing grade. Less than 25 per cent will be in the first two groups of upperclassmen. The sixth group was composed of those who were not keeping up in their work. Those men who had been classed in the first or second group were excused from classes as long as they did not abuse the privilege. As long as I restricted those in the first and second group of upperclassmen it worked admirably. A year ago, finding that it was working pretty well for the upperclassmen, I thought it might work well for the underclassmen. I got the faculty to agree to try it. These three groups have been running riot this year. I had the sense to put in the ruling that a man should have this privilege as long as he did not abuse it. I had one student who had cut seventy lectures and he cannot cut another class. We have gone too far. I want to say that our student self-government is regarded as one of the most desirable features that we have and the thing which has raised the whole tone and the whole spirit of the University.

Senior Council is elected by the students. Twelve will be elected by the class and three will be chosen by those twelve.

In regard to honor system, the instructor presents the examination papers and stays in room or leaves just as he pleases. He remains in the room to answer questions if he wishes. Every student is honor bound to report any suspicion or irregularity. The day after they come to Princeton we have a meeting of all entering men. Monday, before college begins, we have a talk by members of the Senior Council who talk about the Honor Committee and I talk about the spirit of the Honor Committee. At the end of that week there is a reception to which everyone goes and talks again on the honor system. Before the first four weeks' test the whole question is taken up and printed in the paper. Announcements are made up by instructors and Student Council workers. The attitude of the faculty is entirely sympathetic. I was a junior when the system went into effect and I remember that one of our professors thought that the whole thing was all "bunk." The professor or instructor is expected to report to the Honor Committee through the Dean of Students any violation of the system. The examinations must be given in the rooms which are duly scheduled or arranged for by the instructor in charge of the course. Arrangement is made that men must sit in alternate seats upon direction of the Honor Committee. If there are not enough seats the instructor will arrange for another room.

DEAN RIENOW—Our classes are so large that additional rooms cannot be obtained.

DEAN McCLENAHAN—We have one difficulty. It has seemed necessary to restrain the efforts of the faculty in their enthusiasm. For instance, a boy who had to go away wanted to take his examination on the train. The professor asked permission for the boy to do so, but it was refused.

DEAN GOODNIGHT—I find that men will not report those they see cheating. Does the honor system cover drinking, gambling, etc., in addition to dishonesty in examinations?

DEAN McCLENAHAN—It does not apply to such things. If the Senior Council feels that drinking injures the good name of the University the Council says that is the affair of the University. If a man goes away and associates with immoral women or gets drunk and is not arrested they say that that is his personal business. A young man may go to New York and the University not know anything about it.

DEAN GOODNIGHT—Does the University recognize the fact that the young man goes to New York?

DEAN McCLENAHAN—If we get any information we will treat him the same as if his misconduct occurred in Princeton and the Council does not resent any

action taken by the University. I have never seen any evidence of reluctance to report on others. We make the men feel that they are in honor bound to report.

DEAN COULTER—In view of the honor system from your standpoint and the standpoint of the University I am wondering about your having three detectives known to the students. If you have the honor system in examinations and do not have it extend to other matters, do you think that you have gone very far?

DEAN McCLENAHAN—We need them to get information concerning drunkenness, etc. I think there is nothing more damaging than dishonesty.

DEAN RIPLEY—Have you had one or more students try to get even with each other, in the case of one student taking a dislike to another and wanting to see him put out of college?

DEAN McCLENAHAN—No.

DEAN BRADSHAW—Only two schools of the South take any cognizance of anything but dishonesty. The situation was discussed and it was decided by a vote of sixteen out of twenty-one votes cast that student government should include such conduct as gambling, drunkenness, etc. That should indicate that Princeton's point is correct, that we should start with the honor system. Up to 1909 students took cognizance only of dishonesty and later took cognizance of drinking. I do not believe that our students would ever consent to report on other students who have been cheating. These institutions which have the honor system are gradually moving forward to have the system cover the question of drinking, gambling, immorality, etc.

DEAN CLARK—We have never had students on such a committee, although I believe that it would help to have them. The case is this. We do believe that drunkenness is a test of character and we do discipline our students who drink. Two weeks ago there was a drinking party that went to the various fraternity houses. We will say that those men were drunk. One of the men I know and I talked to him and he admitted the fact. The others I do not know. Suppose the student members on the Discipline Committee knew the names of the others, would they be under any obligations to reveal those names to the committee?

DEAN McCLENAHAN—They would feel that they were under obligation to bring the case to the Senior Council.

DEAN CLARK—Would they be willing to have the one known to the Dean penalized and not the others?

DEAN McCLENAHAN—No, they would not feel that it was fair to have him disciplined and not the others.

DEAN CLARK—What would you do in the case of this one man?

DEAN McCLENAHAN—We would bring him before the Discipline Committee and suspend him for half a year, if first offense. If second offense, suspend him for one year.

DEAN RIENOW (regarding self-government)—Should we encourage a student body to ask for self-government or should we wait for them to come to us?

The committee reports were called for. The committee on place of meeting for next year brought in a recommendation that the Conference accept the very hospitable invitation extended the Conference by the University of North Carolina.

The recommendation was voted upon and carried.

The Committee on Nominations brought in the report nominating Dean Rienow as President for next year. The report was accepted and Dean Rienow was declared elected as President for the following year.

Dean Coulter moved that the President appoint a committee to consider the possibility of adopting standard form of scholarship reports. Motion was seconded and carried. The President appointed Deans Field, Bradshaw, Armsby and Ripley.

The Conference adjourned at 4 p.m. in order that all might have an opportunity to visit the buildings of the University.

In the evening members of the Conference were entertained at dinner by Dean and Mrs. Bursley at their home. Following dinner the evening was spent in informal discussion of numerous questions raised by the guests.

FIFTH SESSION

The Conference was called to order by the President, Dean Bursley, Saturday, April 26, at 9:50 a.m. Mr. O. A. Shuder, representing the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America was present and was asked to present a matter in which he was much interested and desired to obtain the co-operation of the Deans:

I may say perhaps that I have been interested for a number of years in the Dean of Men movement. Dean Seashore at Columbia, a good friend of mine, and Dean Scott have urged me to attempt to do this work myself.

I sent out a questionnaire a year ago to the different colleges and universities to find out what was being done in the colleges from the psychological angle in attempting to advise the men along psychological lines. Dean Scott and Dean Seashore are attempting to do more and more along those lines. I am interested in your problems, but perhaps not so much along psychological lines as perhaps human lines. The Federal Council is a sort of clearing house for churches and is attempting to make an analysis of psychological and economic problems and to give this information to the various denominations interested in the Federal Council. We are attempting to give them a digest or analysis of the various psychological and sociological problems. Now we have made an analysis as you know of the coal strike and the situation of the minimum wage. We are getting out a weekly paper which goes to a great many of the colleges and many of the churches. I saw one in one of the churches here. It is an extremely interesting pamphlet and I believe it is going to be helpful. Now going back to what my particular problem is.

I want to thank Dr. Goodnight and Dean Bursley for their help in allowing me to have this chance to present this problem.

The Federal Council has been asked to make a study of the prohibition situation. When I say "prohibition" everyone throws up his hands, palms up or down whichever it may be. I think all of us will admit that it is a very important problem and we have studied it rather carefully. We have obtained statistics from all the jails and all the penitentiaries throughout the United States. We are attempting to make a scientific analysis and we are going at the matter in as careful a way as possible. We may not be able to say anything about prohibition, but we shall find out what the prohibition effects are. After five years this report can be worked up again. Yesterday I was in Detroit and I found from Ford's figures that the absentees for the month of March this year had decreased since March of last year. If jobs are few, men are working hard, will stick on the job longer. We cannot lay this to prohibition. Take the month of March and get the absentees for each day for ten days and we will find that among the absentees there has been 85 per cent whereas three years ago it was 90 per cent and ten years ago it was 95 per cent. The Carnegie Institute is making a study for us. We also work through Healy. Columbia University is attempting to make a study from the psychological angle. Columbia University is interested in the motives for drinking on the part of college students. We have checked up carefully and find it is difficult to find the full motives. I have sent out questionnaires to five hundred artists and they are sending in very interesting reports. A good many claim fatigue and some say depression on account of limit of their work.

Columbia is making a study of this problem to find out where and when and why men drink. If the psychological department of every university will do this

using the same questionnaire we will have a very valuable check on the use of alcohol and perhaps various other things. I have just talked with Professor Adams in the Psychology Department here and he is very much interested in the problem.

If the different colleges will put on this thing more or less simultaneously we are going to get a valuable insight into the lives of college men in regard to this problem. If you agree to this I wonder if you will help us in this matter. Columbia is doing this and I think Michigan will do it. I had thought that perhaps the Deans here might use their influence to help this cause. Dean Hawks of Columbia has suggested that we take the third sheet of the questionnaire and put it in the hands of trustworthy men in fraternities and dormitories and ask these particular men to give a little time and check over the situation that he is familiar with and report the number in the group where the drinking is taking place and the location where it takes place, if a party or a dance, and the type of student, if he can determine this. The Government sends out men to go around and check up, but does not use questionnaires except to a small degree. The Dean of Men has not been in office any great length of time. Has drinking increased in the last year? Has it increased or decreased? We are having a lot of talk about drinking being on the increase. What do you men in the West think of it?

DEAN NICHOLSON—I cannot answer such a question directly as one month the situation is worse and the next month better.

It was the opinion of the majority of the deans that it is decreasing.

DEAN HECKEL—This questionnaire would mean the same as the questionnaire regarding the honor system. A lot of boys would say "if so much cheating is going on I may as well be in on it."

DEAN BURSLEY—I think drinking at Michigan is decreasing, but we are so close to the Canadian border that liquor is easy to get.

ROUND TABLE DISCUSSION

DEAN HUBBARD—We have a Student Council that is supposed to enforce laws. One law is that no student shall destroy property; another is that he shall not smoke in halls or University buildings. Those two laws were passed about eight years ago and I called the attention of the council the other day to those laws on account of violation and they did not seem to know that they were on the books for the reason that they had nothing to do with passing them and they would make no effort to enforce them. What would you do, have the laws repealed or build up a system to enforce them?

DEAN ENGBERG—In our University we all smoked at any time. The S.A.T.C. used many of the buildings during the war and of course all the men smoked. I felt that it was time to go back to normal and called in the editor of the student paper and told him I wanted an editorial written on "Get Back to Normal" and said "let's cut out smoking." A good editorial was written and inside of three days there was no smoking.

DEAN HUBBARD—Just how can we build up sentiment?

DEAN GOODNIGHT—In 1916 our faculty granted to the Student Senate a charter giving them certain powers. We take great pains to make out the line of distinction between the faculty and the student senate. Whatever directly affects the academic work of the students is under the academic committee of the faculty. Whatever does not affect the academic work of the students is under the jurisdiction of the Student Senate. That leaves to the Student Senate the question of finances of the student organization. I soon discovered that we

would have trouble. The student organization can meet and discuss a situation, but it cannot administer laws so I hired an accountant, gave him the title of Student Financial Adviser and gave him a desk in my office. Then I went before the Student Senate and said "you are unable to administer these laws and I am going to assist you in that matter. Here is Mr. ——— and I regard him as your employee rather than mine and he is to enforce your legislation." This man receives the monthly reports of all the classes and audits all of their books. He also receives and audits books of all organizations and publishes reports of such audits. It is the spirit of co-operation which we are practicing at Wisconsin and relationships with the Senate and myself are most cordial. I have never interfered with them and I have referred to them whatever affairs fell within their jurisdiction and we have gone along very well and have accomplished a great deal. Our Student Senate is elected by the student body as a whole and is composed of seventeen men.

DEAN RIPLEY—Do you refer cases of discipline to the Student Senate?

DEAN GOODNIGHT—No, I decide. There is a student court and I turn the matter over to the court. There are nine men in the court and anyone may turn in a case to the student court.

DEAN BRADSHAW—We find that when the whole student body elects a man we get a higher type of man than when a class elects a man.

DEAN GOODNIGHT—This year at election time I waded in and I threw the whole election out of court, then I had a new election held in the registrar's office and his clerks were the tellers and we found that only one ballot was cast by each one.

DEAN BRADSHAW—We have fraternity politics. We find that we very frequently get a higher type man for president of a class than for president of the Student Council. Our class presidents are elected by their comrades and are ex officio members of the council.

MR. ANGELL (one of the assistants to Dean Bursley)—I think here at Michigan class officers are very secondary in importance. They do not have very much to do and they are not very much looked up to as a whole. I think that fact is also shared by the Student Council. I think the student officials here are much less important than they are in many other institutions. The president of the Student Council is a higher type of man than the presidents of the classes. I think that comes about probably under the new system. The members of the council are nominated by the last council and that helps to get a higher type of man. The classes here are so large that one does not know half of the men in his class and he is not apt to be interested in class elections, where the Student Council nominates the men for the succeeding council and the campus as a whole elects a number out of that group. Very little fraternity politics. The Union is the only instance of politics.

DEAN BRADSHAW—If the class officers were taken off the student council there would be much less interest in class elections.

DEAN NICHOLSON—There are two big problems; first, to have leaders, men who will take the initiative. You find them occasionally. Second, continuity of thought and purpose. Without this last they will file regulation on top of regulation without thought of enforcement. We have on our campus two senior honor societies and one junior, all formed for the sole purpose of working for the best interests of the University. For years these organizations worked independently. There was a lot of rivalry between them which defeated their purpose. They themselves recognized this and on their initiative the following procedure is followed: (1) two of them, one senior and a junior, now select their members as

follows—the groups make up a list of nominations which is submitted to a committee, one active, one alumnus, member of faculty, the President, and Dean of Student Affairs. This committee makes the actual selection, based on character, previous record of service, and promise of leadership. Weak scholarship eliminates. This committee may, if it sees fit, add to nominations. As a result there is competition to get track of promising men in the underclasses and develop them. This insures a group of known leaders in junior and senior years. As to continuity of thought—each organization submits each year a budget of things it wishes to work on. These are submitted to me, I list those that are common to two or more programs, then call in the chairman of these groups. We discuss these common subjects and to each group is assigned the responsibility for certain things, it being understood that such a group may at any time call on the others for assistance. Subjects which are not common to two or more groups are not mentioned. By this process some subject for work may be followed through year after year for four or five years and put over. This has happened. It means continuity of thought and effort.

Their work is done by creating sentiment, not as the known effort of a group.

DEAN McCLENAHAN—Of what classes is your Student Council made up?

DEAN NICHOLSON—The All-University Student Council is made up of seniors, juniors, and sophomores.

DEAN RIPLEY—How do they nominate?

DEAN BURSLEY—President of council selects nominating committee of three men, sometimes selects from outside, but usually from within the council. Nominates at least six men from the senior class and at least six men from the junior class who will be seniors in the fall. Three of each are elected. They also nominate at least two candidates for president of the council. The probability is that two of the men who were on the council as juniors will be nominated, but they may go outside. If they select someone from the outside it means that the council the following year will consist of thirteen members as the council will consist of twelve within the council. A man outside may file a petition signed by fifteen per cent of the men in each school or college. A man in the Literary College, which has the largest number of students, might easily be nominated. He could get fifteen per cent of his college to nominate him and he would have a good chance of being elected. If a man from the Dental College got fifteen per cent from his college he would have no chance at all. Most men nominated by petition are the ones who are elected to office. The reason is that if a man gets signatures to a petition he is the man that is voted for.

DEAN GOODNIGHT—At Wisconsin a notice is put in the *Daily Cardinal* that up to a certain date petitions may be filed. These petitions must have at least thirty signatures and are accompanied by from \$2 to \$8 when they are filed. They are turned over to me and we check the eligibility and then return them with the eligibility reports over to the committee and they print a booklet announcing the candidates. They cannot distribute handbills or run propaganda in the paper. The publishing of this booklet is paid for by the money turned in with the petitions.

DEAN BURSLEY—Our council up to this present year was made up of twenty-seven or twenty-eight men and these men were elected by the various classes. We found that a great many of those men elected in that way were not representative men. Some fraternity would decide that they wanted to have some certain man elected to the council. Our council now consists of twelve or thirteen members and three ex officio members, a representative of the athletic interest

selected by the Board in Control of Athletics, the President of the Michigan Union and the editor of the daily.

DEAN McCLENAHAN—Did I understand you to say that membership in this council was the one thing which the student regards highest?

DEAN BURSLEY—No, President of the Union is the highest position, then Editor of the *Michigan Daily*, and third, membership in the Student Council. The President of the Union is on the Board of Governors, but has nothing to do with financial affairs.

DEAN HECKEL—What are the duties of the President of the Union?

DEAN BURSLEY—He is chairman of the Board of Governors and he has to do with everything connected with the Union except financial matters. The Board of Directors of the Union is composed of the President and the recording secretary and five vice-presidents all of whom are students. Then there are three faculty members on the Board of Directors elected by the University Senate. The financial secretary of the Union and five alumni members control all the activities that go on and the President of the Union is chairman of that board. He is also a member of the Board of Governors of the Union which determines the financial policy. The financial secretary and three alumni are elected by the Alumni Association. They control all matters which have to do with financial matters.

DEAN HECKEL—Do any of the student officers get salaries?

DEAN BURSLEY—Only those on publications. The business manager of the daily gets \$750. There is no commission or anything of that kind.

DEAN WORCESTER—How closely does the Dean of Men keep in touch with the council?

DEAN BURSLEY—There is a committee of the council called the Student Council Committee and they are supposed to consult with the Dean of Men at least once a month and at any other time that they may be called in and furthermore the president of the council attends all meetings of the Senate Committee on Student Affairs which consists of the Dean of Students as chairman, the Dean of Women as ex officio members and three faculty senate members appointed by the President, the president of the council and two others selected by him sit in at these meetings. The president of the council and two other members sit in at the meetings of the Discipline Committee.

DEAN RIPLEY—On publications, how many of these institutions pay a fixed salary or allow commissions?

DEAN BURSLEY—Two, business manager and managing editor of the *Michigan Daily*—\$750 each.

DEAN JOHNSON—Editor and business manager of paper get \$50 a month and \$35 a month for annual. Men in charge of annual have to make their salary. In the case of the paper the business manager has made \$1200, the one last year did, but he was too ambitious, he put in too much advertising.

DEAN ENGBERG—We have a manager of student activities who handles nearly everything, including taxes. Organizations must square deficits. The office is self-supporting and a small sum is charged to bring in during the year the amount sufficient to defray the cost of running it. He is also paid a salary by the University. He is secretary of our Athletic Board and is a member of the Committee on Student Organizations by virtue of his office and he enforces all of our rules and the organization that wishes to hold a party must get the ticket validated by him and must furnish him a statement of the number of complimentary tickets, name of those to be there, etc. If he cannot get this information he refers the matter to me.

DEAN BURSLEY—Until just recently a tax has been imposed upon students and they could not vote without paying it. That provided funds for the Student Council. This year the University added \$1200 to the budget of the Dean of Students for the expenses of the Student Council. They buy the uniforms for the cheer leaders, pay the expenses of those who represent the student body at the various conventions, provide for the material for the bonfire on Cap Night and take care of the expense for spring games. Vouchers for these items are OK'd by the treasurer of the council and then by the Dean of Students.

DEAN GOODNIGHT—Must be flowing spring of molten gold at Michigan somewhere.

DEAN HUBBARD—Every year we have anonymous publications. Does anyone else have the same trouble?

DEAN BRADSHAW—We had one and the Student Council found out about it and they told the man to quit or get out of college.

DEAN GOODNIGHT—We had one instance. A young man dropped out of college after he had been in long enough to get affiliated with Sigma Nu and started publishing a yellow journal called the "Proletariat." We have no jurisdiction over him and so do not know just what to do about him.

DEAN BURSLEY—We had one called the "Union County Clarion" which we were able to stop just about five minutes before it was to be distributed. Several men were put out of college and several were suspended.

DEAN BRADSHAW—We had a student issue a similar publication. He ran for a Union office and got sixteen votes of the Jewish variety. Was finally put out of school for dishonesty, but is still publishing his paper.

DEAN GOODNIGHT—Initiation interferes with scholarship and we are trying to control it. At a recent meeting of students they agreed to confine it to the chapter house. I should like to know if there are any other institutions that suffer the effect of rough initiation. I went before the Interfraternity Council last year at the beginning of the second semester just before the initiation started and I wrote a letter to the presidents of the various organizations showing how this matter had affected the scholarship of fraternity men last year and asking them in the name of good fraternity sportsmanship and good Wisconsin spirit to cut out this rough stuff. This latter got into the United Press and went all over the country. It helped a great deal and those who are practicing it now are keeping it behind closed doors.

DEAN BRADSHAW—Would it be too much to ask to get a mailing list of this Conference so that the members may be sent notices of any new things, such as forms, etc.

DEAN GOODNIGHT—We have a "little Italy" where students have no difficulty in getting liquor.

DEAN ENGBERG—We put a student out of college within an hour after he has been arrested for drunkenness.

DEAN BURSLEY—We expel a man for intoxication. We handle a great many cases without bringing them to light.

DEAN MCCLENAHAN—We have three detectives in my office called proctors. They have authority to go into students' rooms or dormitories. We have sent seventy men home for a week. In the case of a second offense a student is sent home for a year. They are sent home for a week so that they may see the father's displeasure. That is usually punishment enough.

DEAN MCCLENAHAN—Do any of the colleges represented have chapel services? Are they voluntary or required by state?

DEAN HUBBARD—It is voluntary at the University of Texas and about fifteen out of four or five thousand attend.

DEAN BRADSHAW—It is required at the University of North Carolina.

DEAN MCCLENAHAN—Students are required to attend chapel on Sundays. A slip is required for each one and any student who fails to have an excuse is dealt with by the committee.

Meeting adjourned.

In the afternoon members of the Conference were guests of the Michigan Athletic Association at the Ohio-Michigan baseball game.

Members of the Conference each feel greatly indebted to the University of Michigan and to Dean Bursley for a successful and very pleasurable meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

EDWARD E. NICHOLSON, Secretary

1924 CONFERENCE OF DEANS OF MEN IN ATTENDANCE
AT THE CONFERENCE

NAME	POSITION	INSTITUTION	FRATERNITY
J. A. Bursley	Dean of Students	University of Michigan	
Stanley Coulter	Dean of Men	Purdue University	Beta Theta Pi
C. R. Melcher	Dean of Men	University of Kentucky	Delta Tau Delta
L. H. Hubbard	Dean of Students	University of Texas	
E. E. Brandon	Dean, College of Liberal Arts	Miami University	Phi Kappa Tau
W. G. Hormell	Dean of Men	Ohio Wesleyan "U"	Delta Tau Delta
Howard McClenahan	Dean of the College	Princeton University	Ivy Club
Floyd Field	Dean of Men	Georgia Tech.	Theta Chi
Jas. W. Armstrong	Assistant Dean of Men	Northwestern University	Wranglers
S. Arthur Johnson	Dean of Faculty	Colorado Agricultural College	Delta Kappa Epsilon
P. G. Worcester	Dean of Men	University of Colorado	Delta Tau Delta
C. P. Steimle	Registrar and Dean of Men	Michigan State Normal	Phi Delta Pi
Robert Rienow	Dean of Men	University of Iowa	Beta Theta Pi
C. S. Yoakum	Bureau of Personal Research	Carnegie Institute of Tech- nology	Phi Gamma Delta
Carl C. Engberg	Executive Dean	University of Nebraska	
J. L. Richmond	Adviser of Men	Toledo University	Delta Upsilon
Leslie I. Reed	Adviser of Men	I. State Teachers' College	
J. E. Foster	Dean of Men	Iowa State College	Theta Chi
E. B. Hill	Assistant to the Dean	Michigan Agricultural College	
Albert K. Heckel	Dean of the College	Lafayette College	Alpha Tau Omega
Francis F. Bradshaw	Dean of Students	University of North Caro- lina	
Giles E. Ripley	Dean of Men	University of Arkansas	
H. H. Armsby	Registrar and Student Adviser	Missouri School of Mines	Sigma Nu
S. H. Goodnight	Dean of Men	University of Wisconsin	Kappa Sigma
J. Milton Vance	Dean of Men	College of Wooster	
Edward E. Nicholson	Dean of Student Affairs	University of Minnesota	Beta Theta Pi
Fred H. Turner	Assistant Dean of Men	University of Illinois	Sigma Alpha Epsilon
Thomas Arkle Clark	Dean of Men	University of Illinois	Alpha Tau Omega
Frank C. Spencer	Dean of Men	Olivet College (Olivet, Mich.)	Phi Alpha Pi